

The
American Historical Review

FERRAND MARTINEZ AND THE MASSACRES
OF 1391

THE terrible massacres of the Jews, in 1391, form a turning-point in Spanish history. They mark the end of the ages of toleration, during which the Peninsula afforded a refuge to the unfortunate children of Israel, and the commencement of the fierce spirit of persecution which rendered the Inquisition inevitable, which expelled the Jews and Moors, and which, by insisting on absolute uniformity of belief, condemned Spain to the material and intellectual lethargy that marked its period of decadence. The popular temper which rendered the massacres possible had been in course of development for a generation, but the outbreak was the work of one man, Ferrand Martinez, Archdeacon of Eciija, who presents himself to us as the ideal example of the mediæval zealot. The document, hitherto inedited, appended to this paper throws some light on the movements preliminary to the massacres and on the unbending resolution of the man to accomplish what he regarded as his duty to God.¹

In spite of the canon law which condemns the Jews to perpetual servitude in punishment for the Crucifixion, and in spite of the repeated urgency of the Holy See, Spain, up to the fourteenth century, had consistently treated them with a reasonable degree of equity. They were not popular favorites, however, for their keen intelligence and business capacity had enabled them to control the finances of the land, both public and private, and the occupations of farmers of the revenue, tax-collectors, and money-lenders, which

¹ Amador de los Rios, in his monumental *Historia de los Judios de España*, has printed several papers relating to these events, but the present one apparently escaped his researches, as it shows that some of the minor details in his narrative are incorrect.

were almost exclusively in their hands, were not calculated to ingratiate them with the people, while the ostentation with which their wealth was displayed was provocative of ill-feeling. There was, therefore, a certain amount of latent popular prejudice, which was capable of being aroused to activity, and to this task the Church of Spain addressed itself. The general council of Vienne, in 1311-1312, although it did not add to the numerous oppressive canons directed against the Jews, took occasion to reprehend in the strongest manner the freedom of worship allowed in Spain to the Moors, and it sharpened the decrees against usury.¹ The Spanish prelates at the council, in their intercourse with their brethren from other lands, doubtless had full opportunity of learning what was thought of Spanish tolerance towards both Moors and Jews, and they seem to have returned home fully inspired with the proscriptive spirit, for the provincial councils subsequently held throughout Spain eagerly endeavored to separate the races and to destroy the kindly intercourse and neighborliness which had existed from time immemorial.² Undoubtedly these efforts must have stimulated prejudice and sharpened antagonism, but they were barren of visible results, for the Jews were too useful to the ruling classes to lack protectors. Not only were they indispensable to the royal finances, but the heavy taxation levied upon them formed a notable and most reliable portion of the revenues of the crown and of the nobles, the churches and the municipalities.

Pedro the Cruel was a friend of the Jews, and it is a sign of their growing unpopularity that his rebellious bastard brother, Henry of Trastamara, found his account in persecuting them. When, in 1355, Henry and his brother, the Master of Santiago, entered Toledo to liberate Queen Blanche of Bourbon, confined in the alcazar, they sacked the smaller *Judería* and slew its twelve hundred inhabitants, without sparing age or sex; they also besieged the principal *Judería*, which was defended by Pedro's friends until his arrival with reinforcements compelled the assailants to withdraw. Five years later, when, in 1360, Henry invaded Castile with the aid of Pedro IV. of Aragon, on reaching Najara he ordered a massacre of the Jews, and, as Ayala states that this was done to win popularity, it may be assumed that he granted free license to plunder. When at length, in 1366, Henry led into

¹ Clementin. Lib. V. Tit. ii., v.

² Concil. Zamorense, ann. 1313 (Amador, II. 561-5); C. Vallisoleti, ann. 1322, cap. xxii. (Aguirre, Con. Hispan., V. 250); C. Leridens., ann. 1325 (Villanueva, Viage Literario, XVIII. 247); C. Tarraconense, ann. 1329 (Aguirre, VI. 370); C. Salmanticens., ann. 1335, cap. xii. (Aguirre, V. 269); C. Dertusan., ann. 1429, cap. xx. (Aguirre, V. 340).

Spain Bertrand du Guesclin and his hordes of Free Companions, the slaughter of the Jews was terrible. Multitudes fled, and the French chronicler deplors the number that found refuge in Paris and preyed upon the people with their usuries. The *Aljama*, or Jewish community, of Toledo purchased exemption with a ransom of a million maravedises, raised in fifteen days, to pay off the mercenaries; but as for a time the whole land lay at the mercy of the reckless freebooters, pillage and slaughter were general. Finally, the assassination of Pedro at Montiel, in 1349, deprived the Jews of their protector, and left Henry undisputed master of the land.¹ When the news of the fratricide reached Avignon, Urban V. asked the Bishop of Sarlat whether the Pope and the Church ought to rejoice over Pedro's death, slain by his bastard brother, seeing that he was a rebel towards the Church, a fautor of Jews and Moors, a propagator of infidelity, and a slayer of Christians. To this the bishop replied that he rejoiced at the expiation of crime, but pitied the man, when Urban sternly rejoined, "Have you not read in the Psalms, 'The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance'?"²

Thus the people were becoming educated to slaughter and pillage of the defenceless Jew, but he was too necessary to the state to be abandoned, and even Henry of Trastámara was forced to give him a measure of protection. Yet legislation was becoming unfriendly, and the ecclesiastics had freer scope to excite abhorrence and stimulate popular passion. The conditions existed for a catastrophe, and Ferrand Martínez was the man to precipitate it. He was not only Archdeacon of Ecija, but he occupied a distinguished position in the great archiepiscopal see of Seville, where he was canon of the cathedral, and Official, or judicial representative of the archbishop, Pedro Barroso. He was a man of indomitable firmness, and though without much learning, he was highly esteemed for his distinguished piety, his solid virtues, and his eminent charity, the latter of which qualities he evinced by founding and maintaining the Hospital of Santa María in Seville.³ Unfortunately he was a fanatic, and the Jews were the object of his remorseless zeal, which his position gave him ample opportunity of exercising to their injury. In his sermons he denounced them savagely, and excited against them the passions of the people, keeping them in constant fear of an outbreak; as ecclesiastical

¹ Ayala, *Crónica de Pedro I.*, año VI. cap. vii.; año IX. cap. vii., viii.; año XVII. cap. viii. — Guillel. Nangiac. Contin., ann. 1366.

² *Quarta Vita Urbani V.* (Muratori, *Scriptt. Rer. Ital.*, III. II. 641).

³ Zuñiga, *Annales de Sevilla*, año 1395, n. 2; año 1404, n. 4.

judge, he extended his jurisdiction over them, against all law and precedent, and his decisions naturally followed the bent of his prejudices, to their great loss and disadvantage. Moreover, in conjunction with other episcopal officials, he issued letters to the local authorities of the towns of the diocese, ordering them to expel the Jews and to suffer none to reside within their limits, — letters which he endeavored to enforce by personal visitation. The *Aljama* of Seville, which was the largest and the richest in the kingdom, became seriously alarmed and made complaint to the king. Little as Henry of Trastámara was favorably disposed to the Jews, the threatened disturbances boded consequences too serious to his finances to be disregarded, and in August, 1378, he addressed a formal command to Ferrand Martínez to desist from his evil courses; nor was this the first time, as is shown by an allusion to previous letters of the same import. To this Martínez paid no obedience; he continued to persecute the Jews judicially, and to inflame the people against them in his sermons. The *Aljama* had recourse to the Holy See and procured certain bulls for their protection, which Martínez disregarded as contemptuously as he had done the royal mandate. Complaint was again made to the throne, and Juan I., who had succeeded his father, Henry II., in 1382, again commanded Martínez not to preach against them and to abandon his usurped jurisdiction over them. This did not silence him, for another royal letter of 1383 complains that he asserted in his sermons that he knew that the king would regard it as a service if any one should assault or damage or slay the Jews, and that all such might feel assured of impunity. As this portended the complete destruction of the *Judería* of Seville, the king threatened him with severe and exemplary punishment unless he should desist. Yet matters went on as before, and the next information we have is in 1388, when the frightened *Aljama* summoned Martínez before the *alcaldes* of the city, and had the three royal letters read publicly, requiring him to obey them. He replied with insults, and a week later put in a formal answer to the effect that he could not preach otherwise than he did, for he only repeated what Christ and the prophets had said of them; that when he endeavored to enforce the laws requiring complete separation between Christian and Jew, he was but obeying the commands of the archbishop, and that if he were to execute the law he would tear down all the twenty-three synagogues in Seville, seeing that they had all been illegally erected.¹

¹ Amador de los Ríos, II. 579-89. It is not much to the credit of Christians that Martínez was justified in his assertion as to the synagogues. As early as 423, Honorius

The dean and chapter became alarmed at the archdeacon's intemperate zeal, and appealed to the king to suppress it, but Juan, in place of enforcing his neglected commands, merely replied that he would look into the matter; the zeal, he said, of the archdeacon was holy, but it must not be allowed to cause disturbance; for, although the Jews were wicked, they were under the royal protection. This royal vacillation naturally encouraged Martinez, who became more inflammatory in his harangues than ever, and symptoms of popular excitement against the Jews became manifest.¹ No one dared to interfere in their defence; but at length Martinez furnished an excuse for silencing him by asserting, in a sermon, that the Pope had no power to license the erection of synagogues. This involved the papal authority and not the Jewish question; and the opportunity was seized of summoning him before an assembly of theologians and doctors. From a sentence pronounced August 2, 1389, by Archbishop Barroso, we learn that he refused to answer except before the people, and on his persisting in this, he was ordered not to preach about the power of the Pope, but he disobeyed, thus rendering himself contumacious and suspect of heresy. He even taught that the Pope could not grant dispensations to the clergy to marry, and that he could not absolve from sins, wherefore, on August 2, the archbishop suspended him, both as to jurisdiction and preaching, till his trial should be concluded.² This afforded the Jews a breathing-space, but Archbishop Barroso died, July 7, 1390. followed, October 9, by Juan I. The chapter must have secretly sympathized with Martinez, for it elected him one of the provisors of the diocese, *sede vacante*, thus clothing him with greater power than ever, and we hear nothing more of his trial for heresy, which evidently was discontinued with the archbishop's death.

Juan had left as his successor Henry III., known as *El Doliente*, or the Invalid, a child of eleven; and quarrels threatening civil war at once arose over the question of the regency. Martinez had now nothing to fear from any quarter, and he proceeded to put his convictions into practice by sending, December 8, to the clergy

and Theodosius II. enacted that no new synagogues should be erected, although existing ones were to be protected from the zeal of those who might endeavor to destroy them (*Cod. Theodos.* Lib. XVI. Tit. viii. l. 25), and this prohibition was sedulously maintained in the canon law (cap. iii., viii., Extra, Lib. V. Tit. vi.).

The twenty-three synagogues referred to were evidently those in the diocese of Seville. In the city itself, as we shall see, there were but three at the time of the outbreak.

¹ Zúñiga, *Annales de Sevilla*, año 1379, n. 3; año 1388, n. 3.

² Amador de los Rios, II. 592-4.

of the various towns, commands, under pain of excommunication, to tear down, within three hours, the synagogues in which the enemies of God, calling themselves Jews, performed their idolatry; the books, including the Law, were to be sent to him, and the building materials to be used for the repair of the churches; if resistance were offered, it was to be overcome by force, and an interdict was to be laid on the towns until the work was accomplished.¹ These orders were not universally obeyed, but enough ruin resulted to cause the frightened *Aljama* of Seville to make earnest representations to the regency, threatening to emigrate if they could not be protected from Martinez. The response to this we have in the subjoined *Acta Capitular*.

From this it appears that the regency acted with promptitude and decision. On December 22, a missive was addressed to the dean and chapter, which was formally read to them, assembled for the purpose, on January 10, 1391. It recited the acts of Martinez, for which it held them responsible, seeing that they had elected him provisor with full knowledge of his character, and had not prevented his unlawful proceedings, wherefore they were liable for the cost of rebuilding the ruined synagogues, and for all damages suffered by the Jews. It required them at once, under pain of making good all past and future damages, and of a fine of a thousand gold *doblas* each, with other arbitrary punishment at the royal pleasure, to remove Martinez from the provisorship and to force him by excommunication to rebuild the synagogues and to abstain from preaching and all other acts injurious to the Jews. Letters of similar import were at the same time addressed to Martinez himself. On January 15 the chapter again assembled, and made a formal reply. With the exception of one member, Juan Ferrandez, they protested their implicit submission to the royal commands; they deprived Martinez of the provisorship, and forbade him to exercise the office, or to preach anything injurious to the Jews, and ordered him, within a year, to rebuild and repair all the synagogues destroyed by his orders. This they presented as their official capitular action, which Martinez must obey under pain of excommunication.

Then Martinez arose and made his reply. The secular sword, he said, was in the hands of the king, to coerce his lay subjects and defend the faith. The spiritual sword was in the hands of the prelates, who were not subject to the royal jurisdiction; the royal letters invaded the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and were invalid. The dean and chapter could not proceed against him, or

¹ Amador de los Rios, II. 613.

deprive him of his office, or require him to rebuild the houses of the devil, which were synagogues of Satan, and in which, thrice daily, Christ and the king and all the Christian people were cursed; for all the synagogues in the land had been built in violation of the law and the canons. As the sentence against him was null and void, being rendered by those who were not his judges, no appeal from it was necessary; but as Christ and the holy Catholic faith were the parties concerned, he appealed to them to judge the matter, and to inflict due penance on those who contravened their commands, saving, always, the king, whose ignorance rendered him worthy of mercy. Moreover, he alleged, truly enough, that he had been accused and condemned without an opportunity of defence. He could prove that the synagogues had been destroyed by order of the late Archbishop Barroso, who had given them to his squires to do as they liked with them, seeing that they had been unlawfully built without licence; and two of them he had torn down during the archbishop's life. He concluded by declaring that he did not repent of anything that he had done.

This dauntless defiance of the royal authority and of the capital sentence shows not only the intractable fanaticism of the man but his confidence in the support of his fellows, and of the people whose passions he had been exciting for so many years. The sequel proves that his confidence was not misplaced. What answer the regency made to his denial of its jurisdiction over him we have no means of knowing, but whatever it was, it exercised no restraint upon him. His preaching continued as violent and incendiary as ever, and the Seville mob grew excited with the prospect of gratifying at once its zeal for the faith and its thirst for pillage. In March the aspect of affairs was more alarming than ever; the rabble were feeling their way with outrages and insults, and the Judería was in hourly danger of being sacked. Juan Alonso Guzman, Count of Niebla, the most powerful noble of Andalusia, was adelantado of the province and alcalde mayor of Seville, and his kinsman, Alvar Perez de Guzman, was alguazil mayor. On March 15 they seized some of the most turbulent of the crowd and proceeded to scourge two of them, but in place of awing the populace this led only to open sedition. The Guzmans were glad to escape with their lives, and popular fury was directed against the Jews, resulting in considerable bloodshed and plunder, but at length the authorities prevailed, with the aid of the nobles, and order was apparently restored. By this time, however, the agitation was spreading to Córdoba, Toledo, Burgos, and other cities. Everywhere fanaticism and greed were aroused, and the

Council of Regency vainly sent pressing commands to all the large towns, in hopes of averting the catastrophe, yet a royal order of April 15, withdrawing the privilege that in Seville no building should be erected within cross-bow-shot of the *Judería*, could only be regarded as a concession to the passions of the mob. The archdeacon continued his inflammatory harangues and sought to turn to the advantage of religion the storm which he had aroused, by procuring a general forcible conversion of the Jews. The excitement grew till it became uncontrollable, and on June 9 the tempest burst in a general rising of the populace against the *Judería*. It was sacked and left a desert. Few of its inhabitants escaped; the number of the slain was reckoned at four thousand, and those of the survivors who did not succeed in flying, only preserved their lives by accepting baptism. Of the three synagogues, two were converted into churches for the Christians who settled in the Jewish quarter, and the third sufficed for the miserable remnant of Israel which slowly gathered together after the storm had passed.¹

From Seville the flame leaped through Castile from shore to shore. In the paralysis of public authority, during the summer and early autumn of 1391, one city after another followed the example; the *Juderías* were sacked, the Jews who would not submit to baptism were slain, and fanaticism and cupidity held their orgies unchecked. The Moors escaped; for although many wished to include them in the slaughter, there was a wholesome restraining fear of reprisals upon the Christian captives in Granada and Africa. The total number of victims was estimated at fifty thousand, but this is probably an exaggeration. For this wholesale butchery and its accompanying rapine there was complete immunity. No attempt was made in Castile to punish the participators. It is true that when Henry attained his majority, in 1395, and came to Seville, he caused Ferrand Martinez to be arrested, but the penalty inflicted must have been trivial, for we are told that it did not affect the high estimation in which he was held, and on his death, in 1404, he bequeathed valuable possessions to his foundation of the Hospital of Santa María.²

In Aragon, although there was a king able and disposed to

¹ Zuñiga, *Annales de Sevilla*, año 1391, n. 1, 2, 3; Ayala, *Crónica de Enrique III.*, año I. Cap. v., xx.; Barrantes, *Ilustraciones de la Casa de Niebla*, Lib. V. Cap. xx.; *Archivo de Sevilla*, Sección primera, Carpeta II. n. 53.

² Ayala, *Crónica de Enrique III.*, año 1391, Cap. xx.; Mariana, *Hist. de España*, Lib. XVIII. Cap. xv.; Colmenares, *Hist. de Segovia*, Cap. xxvii. § 3; Fidel Fita, *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, IX. 347; Zuñiga, *Annales de Sevilla*, año 1391, n. 2; año 1404, n. 4.

enforce the royal authority, and although the Castilian disturbances afforded ample warning, it was impossible to control the passions of the mob. From July 9, when the Jews in Valencia were massacred, until October, the subterranean flame burst forth successively in one city after another — Barcelona, Palma, Gerona, Lérida, Saragossa, witnessed the same exhibitions of savage fanaticism. Yet if Juan I. found himself unable to prevent the massacres, he was determined to punish them, and during the winter of 1391-1392 there were numerous executions of the most guilty participants.¹

Thus, the Church had at last succeeded in opening the long-desired and irreparable chasm between Christian and Jew. It had looked on, silent if not approving, while the Archdeacon of Ecija was bringing about the catastrophe, nor did pope or prelate utter a word of reproach to stay the long tragedy of murder and spoliation which they regarded as an act of God to bring the stubborn Hebrew into the fold of Christ. The old friendliness between the races was a thing of the past, and the final introduction of the Inquisition was rendered inevitable through the creation of a new class — that of the Conversos, Marranos, or New Christians — Jews who professed conversion to escape from slaughter. At this distance of time it is, of course, impossible to apportion the motives which led to the massacres between the attraction of disorder and pillage for the dangerous classes, the odium entertained by many for the Jews, and the fanaticism which served as an incentive and as a cloak for baser passions. That the religious element, however, predominated, would appear from the fact that everywhere the Jews were offered the alternative of death or baptism, and that wherever willingness was shown to embrace Christianity, the murderous work was at once suspended. The pressure was so fierce and overwhelming that whole communities were baptized. At Valencia, an official report of the municipal authorities, made on June 14, five days after the massacre, states that all the survivors, except a few who were in hiding, had already been baptized; they came forward demanding baptism in such droves that in all the

¹ Amador de los Rios, II. 392-4.

In the case of Jayme dez Mas, accused of participation in the sack of the Judería of Barcelona, a royal letter was issued, February 27, 1392, at the request of Vicente de Rippis, prior of S. María de Monserrat, who testified that Jayme was a skilful mason, engaged on the refectory of the priory, and that the work could not be completed without him, as he alone knew the plan. His trial is therefore suspended for a year during which he is to work at the priory without wages, but the sequestration of his property is not to be removed, and it is to be subject to confiscation at the expiration of the term. *Coleccion de Documentos de la Corona de Aragon*, VI. 430.

churches the holy chrism was exhausted, and the priests knew not where to procure more, but each morning the *crismera* would be found miraculously filled, so that the supply held out; nor was this by any means the only miracle which showed that the whole tragedy was the mysterious work of Providence to effect so holy an end. The chiefs of the synagogues were included among the converts, and one can believe the statements current at the time, that in Valencia alone the conversions amounted to eleven thousand. Moreover, it was not only in the scenes of massacre that the good work went forward. So startling and relentless was the slaughter that panic replaced the unyielding fortitude which the Jews had so often displayed under trials equally severe. In many places they did not wait for a rising of the Christians, but at the first menace, or even in anticipation of trouble, they came eagerly forward and clamored to be received into the Church. In Aragon the total number of conversions was reckoned at a hundred thousand and in Castile at as many more; nor is this probably an exaggeration.¹ Nowhere do we hear of any attempt at armed resistance. The terror-stricken wretches either submitted to slaughter or saved their lives by flight or baptism.

In this tempest of conversion Ferrand Martinez yields the place to San Vicente Ferrer. The former sowed the seed, but the latter garnered the harvest, and in fact it was to the fervor of his preaching that subsequently was attributed the excitement leading to the massacres.² This doubtless does him injustice as far as

¹ Amador de los Rios, II. 400-2, 445, 599-604. — Zurita, *Añales de Aragon*, Lib. X. Cap. xlvii. — Llorente's estimate (*Histoire critique de l'Inquisition*, Ch. V. Art. 1, n. 6.) of a hundred thousand families, embracing about a million of souls, is of course untrustworthy.

² Bernaldez, *Historia de los Reyes Catolicos*, Cap. xliii.

The Jews likewise attributed their sufferings to San Vicente. Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir, whose ancestors fled, during this persecution, from Cuenca and settled in Benevento, thus describes "Friar Vincent from the city of Valencia of the sect of Baal Dominic" (*Chronicles*, Bialloblotsky's Translation, I. 265-7):—

"He was unto them a Satan [adversary] and stirred up against them all the inhabitants of the country, and they arose to swallow them up alive, and slew many with the edge of the sword, and many they burned with fire, and many they turned away with the power of the sword from the Lord, the God of Israel. And they burned the books of the Law of our God, and trampled upon them as upon the mire in the streets; and the mother they dashed in pieces upon her children in the day of the Lord's wrath. . . . And some of them killed their sons and daughters that they might not be defiled. . . . Those who were compelled to be baptized became numerous in the land of Sphard [Spain] and they put upon them a mark of distinction unto this day. . . . And the Jews went out from that accursed country which the Lord had cursed. . . . Also upon the Jews that were in Savoy did this grievous oppressor turn his line of desolation. And I have seen in the book Mischath Marehu how they hid themselves in the castles of Savoy in those evil days. And this Belial was in their sight a saint; and the Pope Calixtus

regards their inception, but the fact that he chanced to be on hand in Valencia on that fatal July 9 may perhaps be an indication that he contributed to their continuance. His eloquence was unrivalled; immense crowds assembled to drink in his words; no matter what was the vernacular of the listener we are told that his Catalan speech was intelligible, as was experienced by Moor, Greek, German, Frenchman, Italian, and Hungarian, while the virtue which flowed from him on these occasions healed the infirm, and he repeatedly restored the dead to life.¹ Such was the man who, during the prolonged massacres, and subsequently, while the terror which they excited continued to oppress the unfortunate race, traversed Spain from end to end with restless and indefatigable zeal, preaching, baptizing, and numbering his converts by the thousand. On a single day in Toledo he is said to have converted no less than four thousand. It is to be hoped that in some cases, at least, he may have restrained the pious zeal of the murderous mob, if only by hiding its victims in the baptismal font. That his methods, however, did not commend themselves to those who desired peace would appear from the story that when he wished subsequently to carry on his work in Portugal and applied to João I. for permission to enter his dominions, the monarch replied that he could come, but only on condition of wearing upon his head a red-hot iron crown — an offer which he wisely declined.² Whatever may have been San Vicente's share in prolonging the massacres, there can be no doubt that their commencement is attributable to Ferrand Martinez, who therefore is entitled to be bracketed with Cardinal Ximenez as the two Spaniards who have contributed most largely to the downfall of their country's prosperity and power.

In the horror excited throughout the civilized world by the atrocities committed on the Armenians, it is perhaps wholesome for us to be reminded that Christian fanaticism has been capable of still greater enormities, and that even in the nineteenth century a cultured scholar like Villanueva has been found to characterize the massacres of 1391 as a *guerra sacra contra los Judios*.³

HENRY CHARLES LEA.

wrote his memory among the saints and appointed feast-days unto his name, on the fifth day of the month of April. May God recompense him according to his deeds!"

¹ *Chron. Petri de Arenis*, ann. 1408 (Denifle, *Archiv für Litt.- und Kirchengeschichte*, 1887, p. 647); *Coleccion de Documentos de la Corona de Aragon*, I. 118; *Chron. Magist. Ord. Prædic.*, Cap. xii. (Martene, *Ampliss. Collect.*, VII. 387); Salazar, *Anamnesis Sancti Hispan.* II. 513; Tournon, *Hommes Illustres de l'Ordre de S. Dominique*, III. 37; Alban Butler, *Vie des Saints*, 5 Avril.

² Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VIII. 125 (Leipzig, 1890).

³ Villanueva, *Viage Literario*, XVIII. 20.

ACTA CAPITULAR DEL CABILDO DE SEVILLA.

10-15 DE ENERO, AÑO DE 1391.

(MSS. de la Biblioteca Nacional de España, Dd. 108, fol. 78.)

Martes dies dias de Enero, año del nascimiento del nuestro Salvador Jesu Christo de mil e trescientos et noventa et uno años, en este dia sobredicho a ora de tercia estando en la muy noble Cibdat de Sevilla dentro de la casa del Cabildo de la Iglesia de Sevilla et estando y el dean et Cabildo de la dicha Iglesia ayuntados, parescio y Gutierre Lorenço, Alguacil de nuestro Señor el Rey en presencia de mi Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico de esta dicha Cibdat et de los otros escrivanos de Sevilla que a esto fueron presentes, el dicho Gutierrez Lorenço dio a mi el dicho Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico para que leyese al dicho Dean et Cabildo dos cartas de nuestro Señor el Rey escritas en papel e firmadas de su nombre et selladas con su sello de aporidad de cera a las espaldas, et en las espaldas de las dichas cartas estan escriptos en la una dellas siete nombres et en la otra seis, de la quales cartas el thenor dellas dis en esta manera.

Don Enrique por la gracia de Dios Rey de Castilla, de Toledo, de Leon, de Galicia, de Sevilla, de Cordova, de Murcia, de Jahen, de Algarbe, de Algesira et Señor de Viscaya et de Molina, al Dean et Cabildo et provisosores de la Iglesia de la mui noble Cibdat de Sevilla, Salud et gracia. Sepades que por parte de las Aljamas de los Judios desta dicha Cibdat et de las villas et lugares de su Arzobispado me fué dicho et querellado en como vos otros que escogierades a Ferrand Martines Arzediacono de Ecija por uno de los provisosores de esta dicha iglesia vacante la seyendo persona que se atreve a fasser algunas cosas contra rason et derecho lo qual se torna en daño et verguenza desa Iglesia et en gran menosprecio mio et de la mi justicia. Otrosy en gran daño et perjuicio et desonrra et estruimiento de los dichos Judios et de sus synagogas, seyendo contra ellos sin rason et contra derecho, con opinion et erronea a les derribar et mandar derribar injustamente contra derecho algunas de las dichas sus synagogas, sobre lo qual por parte de los dichos Judios me fueron mostrados dos traslados signados de escrivanos publicos de dos cartas quel dicho Arcediano de Ezija dio para derribar algunas sinagogas, la una en que se contiene en como embiava mandar al Vicario et clerigos et capellanes et sacristanes de la villa de Ezija que so pena de excomunion luego vista su carta fasta tres oras siguientes derribassen et fisiesen derribar la casa et sinagoga en que los Judios de la dicha villa de Ezija fasian su idolatra et que mandava al dicho Vicario que le embiase los libros et la Tora para que ficiese dellos lo que fuesse derecho, et que si algund ome con fuerza et poderio gelo defendiese que le mandava que pusiese luego entredicho en la dicha villa fasta que se dexase dello et se cumpliese la dicha su carta. Otrosy en la segunda carta se contenia en como el dicho arcediano mandava derribar la sinagoga de los Judios de Alcalá de Guadaira por la qual dicha su carta da fe en como la mando derribar et der-

ribada et que mandava que el Solar de la dicha sinagoga fuese para la fabrica de la Iglesia de Sant Miguel de la dicha villa de Alcalá de Guadayra por que asy como antes se servia en ella el Ante-Christo se sirviese despues nuestro Señor Jesuchristo para que la oviesen et fuese suya con todas sus posesiones que a la dicha casa sinagoga eran dadas et que la pudiesen vender et fissiesen dellas lo que quisiesen, en tal manera et con tal condicion que las non pudiese aver para siempre jamas Judio alguno et que si las oviesen en qualquier manera que fueren despues tornadas a la dicha Iglesia de Sant Miguel segund que todo esto et otras cosas mas cumplidamente es contenido en los traslados de las cartas del dicho Arcediano que en esta sason me fueran mostrados, en que parece que es asi, por la qual rason dise que non tan solamente el dicho Arcediano mando derribar las dichas dos sinagogas de Alcalá de Guadayra et de Ezija como dis que mando derribar las sinagogas de Coria et de Cantillana, lugares del arzobispado de Sevilla. Otrosi que ha dado sus cartas et mandamientos para derribar las otras sinagogas de las villas et lugares del dicho arzobispado de Sevilla. Lo qual dis quel dicho Arcediano fiso en enfuërço et ayuda et favor de vos otros et otrosi con el dicho oficio de la dicha provisoria que le vos distes, en lo qual dis que han recebido et reciben mui gran daño et agravio et que estan en punto de se despoblar et yr et fuir de los mis reynos a morar et a vebir a otras partes. Otrosi disen que pues vosotros sabiedes las maneras et condiciones del dicho Arcediano, lo que avia fecho et fasia contra los dichos Judios en como pedricava et determinava en esta materia algunas cosas que eran derechamente contra el poderio apostolical, por la qual rason el Arzobispo de Sevilla aviendolo por sospechoso de eregia segun parece por instrumento publico que ante mi fue mostrado en que parece que es asy et lo defendio que non pedricase nin usase de poder alguno que del oviese, et pues vos le escogistes por uno de los dichos provisosores et sedes tenido a todos los daños que por esta razon ellos an rescibido, et otrosi que de derecho sedes tenido vosotros et el dicho Arcediano de los refaser et adobar et reparar a vuestra costa et mision las dichas sus sinagogas que asi dis quel dicho Arcediano los derribo et mando derribar et embiaronme pedir merced que les proveyese sobrello de remedio et yo tovelo por bien et so mucho maravillado de vos en tomar et escoger al dicho Ferrand Martines Arcediano por uno de los provisosores desa dicha iglesia sabiendo et seyendo certificados de todo lo que sobre dicho es. Otrisy en consentir al dicho Arcediano en faser las tales cosas como estas et non gelo extrañar et reprender dello, por lo qual afallecimiento del dicho Ferrand Martines Arcediano sodes tenidos de faser et adobar et reparar a vuestra costa et mision todas las sinagogas que asi el dicho Arcediano ovo mandado derribar et fueron derribadas. Otrosi de emendar et satisfacer a los dichos Judios o a quien este negocio atañe, et menoscabos que por esta rason les han recrecido, por que vos mando que luego vista esta mi carta que pongades en este fecho el remedio que cumple, et en proveyendo sobresto tiredes et privedes al dicho Arcediano de la dicha provisoria quel diestes, por quel con esfuërço et favor del dicho oficio non pueda faser de aqui adelante las semejantes cosas. Otrosi

que le non consintades de aqui adelante derribar nin mandedes derribar alguna nin algunas de las sinagogas de las villas et lugares del dicho arzobispado de Sevilla nin que proceda sobresta rason contra los dichos Judios nin faga contra ellos cosa alguna que non deva nin faga pedricaciones nin sermones contra ellos por que los pudiesen recrecer a ellos ni a las dichas sus sinagogas mal nin daño nin destruimiento alguno, et mas ante le constrenid et apremiad por censura eclesiastica segunt mandan los derechos que rrefaga et adobe et repare luego todas sinagogas que asy injustamente et contra derecho fiso et fueron derribadas por su mandado bien et complidamente segund que por otra mi carta gelo embio mandar, et en otra manera sed siertos que si lo asy non fisieredes nin cumplieredes et consintieredes quel dicho arcediano use mas de la dicha provisorio, que todos quantos males et daños et destruimientos por su culpa et ocasion fasta aqui an venido et vinieren de aqui adelante a los dichos Judios et a las dichas sus sinagogas que de los bienes propios de vosotros et si los vuestros bienes non alcanzaren de los bienes de la vuestra mesa capitular lo mandaremos todo pagar et refaser et emendar et satisfacer a los dichos Judios o a quien substoviere [?], porque sea castigo a vos otros y en exemplo a todos quantos lo vieren, et los unos ni los otros non fagades ende al por alguna manera so pena de la mi merced et de mill doblas de oro a cada uno de vos para la mi Camara, et de como esta mi carta vos fuere mostrada et los unos et los otros la cumplieredes mandamos so la dicha pena a qualquier escrivano publico que para esto fuere llamado que de ende al que nos la mostrare testimonio signado con su signo porque yo sepa en como cumplides mio mandado la carta leyda dadgela. Dada en Madrid, veinte et dos dias de Desiembre, año de nacimiento de nuestro salvador Jesuchristo de mill et trescientos et noventa años. Yo, Pero Ferrandes la fis escrivir por mandado de nuestro Señor el Rey. Yo el Rey—En las espaldas de la dicha carta estan escriptos unos nombres que disen asy: Petrus Archiepiscopus Toletanus.—Yo el Conde.—Nos el Maestre.—Nos el Maestre.—Diego Furtado.—Juan de Velasco.—Pero Lopez.

Et las dichas cartas del dicho Señor Rey mostradas et leydas, el dicho Gutierre Lorenço dixo al dicho Dean et Cabildo que cumpliesen las dichas cartas segund que por ellas el dicho Señor Rey gelo embiava mandar et que de como gelo desía que pedia et pedio testimonio. E luego el dicho Dean et Cabildo tomaron las dichas cartas et dixieron que las recebían et obedecían asy como cartas de su Rey et de su Señor natural su cuya merced veían, et dixieron a mi el dicho Alfonso Gonzales, escrivano publico, que les diese traslado dellas et que abrian su acuerdo et que responderían, el qual traslado de las dichas cartas et del dicho pedimento quel dicho Gutierre Lorenço les fiso les fue dado.

Et despues desto, Domingo quince dias del dicho mes de Enero del dicho año, un poco antes del sol puesto, dentro en la casa que disen de las Cuentas, que es dentro en la Iglesia de Santa Maria, et estando y presentes capitularmente ayuntados Don Pero Manuel Dean et Don Martin Miguell Chantre, et Don Pero Alfonso Thesorero, et Don Juleo Perez Maestre

escuela, et Don Ferrand Martinez Arcediano de Ecija, et Don Juan Sanchez Arcediano de Xerez, et Mosen Juan de Pumes Arcediano de Reyna, et Don Gutierre Perez Arcediano de Castro, et Joan Garcia et Joan Martinez et Miguel Ferrandes et Alvar Perez et Alfonso Lopez et Gonzalo Sanchez et Juan Sanchez et Juan Ferrandez et Pero Alfonso et Bartholome Martinez et Alfonso Segura et Miguel Rodriguez, todos estos canonigos et beneficiados de la dicha Iglesia de Sevilla, en presencia de mi, el dicho Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano et de los dichos escrivanos, et en presencia del dicho Don Ferrand Martinez Arcediano, el dicho Don Pero Manuel en respondiendo dixo por si et por todos los sobredichos asy personas como canonigos et por sy mandados, que vista la carta y mandado del dicho Señor Rey que otra vegada la obedecieron et avian obedecido et aun agora obedecian como carta et mandamiento de su Rey et de su Señor natural a quien Dios por su santa merced dexé vevir et reynar por muchos tiempos et luengos et buenos al su santo servicio. Que, aviendo su acuerdo et deliberacion que ellos que querian cumplir mandado et servicio del dicho Señor Rey asy como en la dicha carta se contiene et que en cumpliendola luego el dicho Dean por sy et en nombre de los sobredichos asy personas como canonigos non desacordando alguno, mas aviendolo por firme, salvo el dicho Juan Ferrandez canonigo que non acordo con ellos, dixo que privaban et privaron al dicho arcediano Ferrand Martinez del oficio de la provisoria que primeramente le avian encomendado vacante la See, et que le defendian que de aqui adelante non usare del dicho oficio. Et otrosi dixo mas el dicho Dean por si et por todos los sobredichos personas et canonigos que mandava et mando al dicho Don Ferrand Martinez Arcediano que si pedicare la palabra et el evangelio de nuestro Señor Jesu Christo empero que en sus pedricaciones et sermones que non dixiese algunas cosas por que pudiese recrecer algun bollicio et escandalo o mal o daño alguno contra los Judios et contra las sus sinagogas o contra alguno dellos. Otrosi mando el dicho Dean al dicho Arcediano por sy et en nombre de los sobredichos que de oy que esta respuesta es dada fasta un año primero siguiente refaga et repare o faga refaser et reparar todas las sinagogas que derribo et mando derribar en qualesquier lugar o lugares de este arzobispado de Sevilla fasta agora, siguiendo el tenor et mandamiento de la dicha carta del dicho Señor Rey. Et en todo esto que dicho es, el dicho arcediano Don Ferrand Martinez, que lo guarde et faga et cumpla en la manera que dicho es so pena de excomunion. Et dixieron que todo esto que sobredicho es davan por respuesta los dichos Dean et beneficiados sobredichos capitularmente ayuntados a la dicha carta del dicho Señor Rey et al pedimento et requerimiento quel dicho Gutierre Lorenzo avia fecho en nombre del dicho Señor Rey, et pidieron a mi el dicho Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico que asy de la presentacion de la dicha carta del dicho Señor Rey como del requerimiento quel dicho Gutierre Lorenzo les avia fecho, como desta respuesta aquellos davan que les diese ende un testimonio o dos o mas los que los cumpliese en publica forma para guarda de su derecho.

E luego el dicho mandamiento fecho por el dicho Dean en presencia

de los dichos personas et canonigos de la dicha Iglesia en la manera que dicha es, el dicho Don Ferrand Martinez arcediano respondió a ello et dixo que salva la Real Magestad de mi Señor el Rey que es Rey de Castilla et de Leon por la gracia de Dios, al qual el nuestro Señor Jesuchristo dio el espada para castigar a los sus subditos legos, de la qual espada dise el apostol sant Pablo non es sin rason quel Rey traya la espada delante si, la qual tiene para castigar a los malos et defender a los buenos, et asy como esta espada usa el, la qual recibio del altar de sant Pedro, asy la Iglesia de Dios que es el Papa et los Cardenales et los perlados et toda la cleresia recibieron otra espada de aquel mismo altar para castigar et corregir todos aquellos que son en orden de la cleresia, los quales escogio nuestro Señor Dios por suerte suya para defendimiento de la Santa Fe Catolica, et asy son diversas jurisdicciones, et la Santa Iglesia de Dios nin los sus clerigos non pueden ser juzgados por la jurisdiccion Real, antes la Iglesia de Dios ha menester a los Reyes et principes et a la justicia seglar que ayuden et amparen a la Santa Fe Catolica, et por aquesto dixo que decia et respondia quel dicho Señor Rey nin los que las cartas que contra el fueron dadas firmaron non lo pudieron faser por quanto el era et es de la jurisdiccion de la Iglesia nin ellos nin el dicho dean nin los sobredichos non pueden proceder contra mi nin privar de mi oficio de la provisoría en el qual perfectamente uze et uzaba en mandar que fisiese et reparasse las dichas casas del diablo que son de las sinagogas de Sátanas, en las quales especialmente se maldice Ihesuchristo tres vegadas cada dia et al Rey et a todo el pueblo Christiano. Ante dixo mas que todas quantas sinagogas maldichas ha en el Reyno se deficaron et se alzaron despues que las leyes et canones mandaron que non se fisiesen nin se deficasen en algun tiempo do el nombre de Ihesuchristo se alavava. Et porque tal sentencia et mandamiento como este que lo avian fecho era fecho por aquellos que non eran mis jueces episcopi jure, era ninguno et por tanto non era y necesario de tal sentencia et mandamiento apelar, pero que dixo que por quanto era este pleito de Ihesuchristo et de la Santa Fe Catolica que apelava et lo ponía en el su santo juicio et pediría que lo judgasse et lo defendiesse et diese penetencia aquel que en este caso fiso contra sus mandamientos, salva siempre la Real Magestad di mi Señor el Rey, el qual es digno de misericordia en lo que ignorante fesía. Quanto mas que dixo, que en este pleito non fuera demandado nin oydo nin vencido ante quien devia nin como devian, guardada la orden quel derecho quiere en este caso, mas que por sola acusacion que le fisieron los traydores enemigos de la Fe fue luego sin abdiencia condempnado et dadas cartas que se fisiese execucion non se poniendo en las dichas cartas si era asy como quiera que aunque non se ponga de derècho se entiende et que esto dava por respuesta, protestando que todo tiempo la pudiese corregir et emendar et añadir et menguar. Quanto mas que dixo que las sinagogas que derribo que esta presto de provar quel Arzobispo Don Pedro las mando derribar et las dio a sus escuderos que las vendiesen et fisiesen dellas lo que quisiesen por quanto eran deficadas contra la santa Iglesia de Dios et sin licencia de alguna persona.

Et aun dixo el dicho Arcediano quel fisiera derrocar, veiendo el dicho Arzobispo, dos mal dichas sinagogas, la una en el corral de los tromperos et la otra en la varrera de Don Enrique antiguas, las quales estan derribadas oy dia, de lo qual dixo que non se arrepentia porque las mandava derrocar, et que esto dava por respuesta.

Et de todo esto en como paso el dicho Gutierre Lorenzo pedio a mi el dicho Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico que le diese un testimonio o mas si menester oviese para la mostrar al dicho Señor Rey et alli o deviese. Et otrosy los dichos Dean et personas et canonigos et el dicho Don Ferrand Martinez arcediano pidieron a mi el dicho Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico que les diese ende sendos testimonios o mas sy menester oviesen para guarda de su derecho, et yo digelos a cada una de las dichas partes el suyo que fueron fechos en los dichos dias, mes et año sobredicho. Ay sobrescripto entre renglones odis agora et odis sobre, et odis Christo et non le empesca, et ay raydo et emendado odis avian et odis merced et odis privaron, et odis altar, en non le empesca.

Yo Andres Gonzales, escrivano de Sevilla, so testigo. Yo Diego Ferrandes, escrivano de Sevilla, so testigo. Et yo Alfonso Gonzalez escrivano publico de Sevilla la fiz escribir, fuy presente a todo lo sobredicho, fis en el mio signo, so testigo.

Esta esta respuesta en tres pleigos de papel empalmados por lo angosto y cosidos con hilo y cada uno esta rubricado en la espalda por el mismo Alfonso Gonzalez. Letra notariesca.

RADISSON AND GROSEILLIERS: PROBLEMS IN EARLY WESTERN HISTORY

THE publication in 1885 of the journal of Pierre-Esprit Radisson,¹ a French explorer of the middle part of the seventeenth century, gave students of western history several hard problems to solve, and the process of solution is not yet finished. The questions raised were as important as they were interesting; for, among other things, the discovery of the upper Mississippi River was involved. Radisson clearly claims that honor for himself and his brother-in-law and constant companion, Medard Chouart des Groseilliers,² he asserting that they went far down that river upon their first western voyage, which, if it took place at all, must have taken place nearly twenty years before the famous journey of Joliet and Marquette in 1673.

Radisson's claim to the honor of the discovery of the upper Mississippi River has been passed upon and approved by very respectable authority,³ and yet it seems destined to go the way of some of Hennepin's stories, of La Hontan's fables, and of Margry's bubble.

In his account of his western voyages Radisson rarely gives the date of the month, and in not a single instance does he record the year in an exact manner. By his neglect in this respect he has caused no end of trouble and confusion. For instance, Benja-

¹ Published by the Prince Society of Boston and edited by Gideon D. Scull of London. Radisson's narratives of his earlier experiences and western explorations, written in 1665, after ill-treatment by the French had driven him to seek patronage in England, were in the possession of Charles II.'s secretary of the admiralty, Samuel Pepys, whose diary is familiar to every lover of quaint literature. Most of the Pepys manuscripts became scattered, some were destroyed, but Radisson's narratives of his first four voyages were rescued by collectors and are now in the Bodleian Library. His Hudson Bay narratives are in the British Museum.

² A native probably of Touraine, born about 1621, who settled in New France in early youth. His first wife was a daughter of the pilot Abraham, after whom the Plains of Abraham are named. She was a goddaughter of the great Champlain, and a namesake — Hélène — of Champlain's girl-wife. She died in 1651, leaving a son, also named Medard, who figured, like his father, in the history of Hudson Bay. In 1653 Groseilliers married Radisson's sister Margaret. She, as well as his first wife, was a widow when he married her.

³ *Story of Wisconsin*, R. G. Thwaites; *Wisconsin Hist. Coll.*, XI. 66; S. S. Heberd, *Wisconsin under French Dominion*; Sulte, *History of the French Canadians*.

min Sulte,¹ the French-Canadian historian, is of the opinion that the first voyage of Radisson and Groseilliers is identical with that of the two nameless Frenchmen mentioned in the *Jesuit Relations* of 1656, who returned to New France in that year after an absence of two years, having penetrated beyond Lake Michigan. Other writers, notably N. E. Dionne,² the learned librarian of the legislature of the province of Quebec, declare that the first voyage west took place between 1658 and 1660. Dionne places the second western voyage between 1661 and 1663, and this view is generally accepted by those who believe that the first voyage terminated in 1660. Sulte, on the other hand, states that the second western journey came to an end in 1660, and the late Dr. Edward D. Neill, of St. Paul, Minnesota,³ assigns the same date for the termination of Radisson and Groseilliers' Lake Superior voyage, which was their second voyage.

That there should be any question as to the time when the second voyage ended is a matter of some surprise. It is convenient, for the purpose of this article, to consider this voyage first.

For two hundred years the identity of the two daring Frenchmen, mentioned in the *Jesuit Relations* of 1660, who arrived at Quebec in August of that year, with three hundred Algonquins paddling sixty canoes laden with furs, was a mystery. These two Frenchmen, according to the *Relations*, had spent the previous winter upon the shores of Lake Superior; had found at six days' journey toward the southwest from that lake the remnants of the Petuns, a Huron tribe whom the persecutions of the Iroquois had before that time driven westward even of the Mississippi River; these two Frenchmen had baptized children dying of disease and famine; had made several excursions to neighboring tribes, and had visited the Nadouessioux, a Dakota nation, among whom they saw women with their noses cut off and with a round piece of scalp torn off the tops of their heads—the punishment for adultery. The two intrepid explorers, when they returned to the St. Lawrence settlements, told the Jesuits how numerous the Sioux were, and how these savages covered their huts with furs or made themselves dwellings of clay. The *Relations* also quote the two Frenchmen as saying that the Sioux, being in a woodless country, made fire with mineral coal.

¹ *History of the French Canadians.*

² *Chouart et Radisson*, in *Memoirs of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1893 and 1894.

³ *Discovery along the Great Lakes*, in the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, edited by Justin Winsor.

The *Journal of the Jesuits* for 1660 supplies the name of one of these two voyageurs, the following passage being found in it: "On the 17th [August] Monseigneur of Petræ [Laval, who afterwards became the first bishop of Quebec] left for his visit. . . . He arrived at Montreal on the 21st, . . . where the Ottawas had arrived on the 19th. They were in number three hundred. Des Grosillères was in their company, who had gone to them the year before. They had departed from Lake Superior with one hundred canoes; forty turned back, and sixty arrived, loaded with peltry to the value of 200,000 livres. At Montreal they left to the value of 50,000 livres, and brought the rest to Three Rivers. They come in twenty-six days, but are two months in going back. Des Grosillers wintered with the Bœuf tribe, who were about four thousand, and belonged to the sedentary Nadoueseronons. The Father Menar, the Father Albanel, and six other Frenchmen went back with them." Father Albanel did not go very far, being abandoned by the Indians before he had really gone beyond the French settlements, but Father Menard went on to the Lake Superior country and to his death in the wilds of northwestern Wisconsin.

Des Groseilliers had been in the employ of the Jesuits, and he was therefore very well known to them; besides, he was considerably older than Radisson was, and would naturally be looked upon as the leader of the expedition, as he probably was in fact; and very likely it is for these reasons that he only is mentioned in the *Journal of the Jesuits*. The *Jesuit Relations* show that there were two voyageurs in the party which returned to Quebec from Lake Superior in August, 1660; the *Journal of the Jesuits* shows that one of these was Groseilliers, and Radisson himself states that he was the other.

In the main Radisson's account tallies very well with the *Jesuit Relations* and with the *Journal of the Jesuits*. He relates that when he and Groseilliers arrived at Chequamegon Bay, on Lake Superior, the Hurons with whom they had gone west stated that the place where their tribe had taken refuge was five great days' journey inland. The *Relations* state that the voyageurs had found the Hurons at six days' journey toward the southwest from Lake Superior. Radisson and Groseilliers soon went to the Huron village, and with the Hurons they spent the following winter, during which hundreds of Indians—many Ottawas had joined them in the meantime—died of famine. The *Relations*, it will be remembered, mention Indian children who died of disease and famine. Later the voyageurs and their Indian companions wandered into the Mille Lacs region of Minnesota and were soon

visited by "ambassadors" of the Nadoneseronons (Nadouessioux, Nation of the Bœuf), who, among other things, wept upon the heads of the two Frenchmen "untill we weare wetted by their tears,"—something which the Sioux were wont to do, as early explorers and historians abundantly testify. Radisson says that he and Groseilliers afterwards visited the Nation of the Bœuf, finding a town where there were great cabins covered with skins and mats; where, in punishment for adultery, noses were cut off, and often the scalp at the crown, and where, there being no wood, moss was used for making fires.

Taking all the circumstances into consideration, it would not be easy to find three distinct accounts of one expedition into a strange country that tallied more closely than do the accounts of that voyage to Lake Superior which we find in the *Jesuit Relations*, the *Journal of the Jesuits*, and Radisson's *Journal*. The return of Radisson and Groseilliers from their second trip, the one to Lake Superior, in August, 1660, is thus fully proven.¹

This was the last journey that Radisson claims to have made to the west. His own journal furnishes evidence that the voyage terminated in August, 1660. In speaking of the journey homeward he states that they passed the Long Sault, on the Ottawa River, shortly after the defeat and death of Dollard and his band of heroes. That tragedy occurred on May 21, 1660. Furthermore, in describing the westward part of this voyage, Radisson draws a very vivid picture of the Grand Portal, near Munissing, on the south shore of Lake Superior, and declares that he was the first Christian that ever saw it. Had his voyage to the head of Lake Superior taken place after 1660, Radisson would not have been the first Christian to see the Grand Portal, for Father Menard passed it² in the fall of 1660 before he reached Keweenaw Bay.

Right here it may not be out of place to speak of a widespread error that has been made regarding Radisson and Groseilliers and Father Menard. In several standard historical works³ it is stated that Father Menard accompanied Radisson and Groseilliers on their second westward trip. The mistake has been made so often, and by such excellent writers, that it is generally believed. But

¹ This is substantially the view taken of the question by the Rev. Chrysostom Verwyst, O.S.F., the learned author of *Missionary Labors of Fathers Marquette, Menard, and Allouez in the Lake Superior Region*. There is not living any better authority on early Northwestern history. This reverend gentleman, by the way, absolutely repudiates Radisson's third voyage, pronouncing it a fabrication.

² *Jesuit Relations*, 1664.

³ Dr. Neill's *Discovery along the Great Lakes*, already quoted, and *From Cartier to Frontenac*, by Justin Winsor.

that it is an error is plain. The cause of the error is equally plain. It will be noticed that in the part of the *Journal of the Jesuits* which has just been quoted it is stated that "Father Menar . . . went back with them." "Them" means the Ottawas, not Groseilliers and his companion, who, according to Radisson himself, never went west after the voyage which ended in 1660. A misunderstanding of the pronoun "them" and a consequent belief that Radisson and Groseilliers went west again are responsible for the erroneous statement that they went west again in 1660 and were accompanied by Father Menard. Some writers who have fallen into this mistake contend that the *Journal of the Jesuits* is chronicling the return of Radisson and Groseilliers from their first voyage, but they take this position in the face of the fact that Radisson himself says that they rested a year after the first voyage to the west, and that another entry in the *Journal of the Jesuits* shows that Groseilliers was in Quebec in May, 1662, at which time these writers contend that he was in the Lake Superior country.

Radisson says that the second western voyage took two years. Passing Sault Ste. Marie and an island to which they gave the name of Four Beggars, as well as a river, apparently Little Iron River, they skirted the south shore of Lake Superior, passing the Pictured Rocks and the Huron islands. They camped at the mouth of Huron River, portaged across Keweenaw point and finally reached Chequamegon Bay, Wisconsin, where they built a little fort—the first building erected by white men on Lake Superior—and dwelt therein while their Huron companions went to visit their families and countrymen. They themselves visited the Huron tribe afterward, and the following spring, after visiting the Nadouessioux, Radisson says that in company with some Christinos (who, under the name of Crees, are still found north of the lake region, in British America), they went to the Bay of the North, as he calls Hudson Bay. On the shore, probably of James Bay, they saw a barrack which had been built by white men. The Indians of that region told them of the presence of white men in those waters at a previous time. Our explorers returned by the way by which they had come, except that they revisited a fort which "the nations of the north" had built in Minnesota, west of Lake Superior, when the two explorers had been there nearly a year before, and at the fort they spent the latter part of the second winter. They started home in the spring.

The *Journal of the Jesuits* for 1660 states that it was "the year before" that Groseilliers joined the Ottawas with whom he returned to Quebec in August of that year. Does this necessarily

mean, as some writers, Sulte among the number, tacitly contend, that Radisson and Groseilliers were absent on this voyage only one year? The statement in the *Journal of the Jesuits* is certainly vague, and it has been found,¹ moreover, that Pierre-Esprit Radisson was godfather to Marguerite, daughter of Medard Chouart (Groseilliers) on April 15, 1659, Father Menard, who was then stationed at Three Rivers, performing the ceremony of baptism. But Dionne, the principal merit of whose work — the most recent one on the subject — is the genealogical research that it shows, asserts that there were at Three Rivers two men named Pierre-Esprit Radisson, one of them our voyageur and the other probably his uncle. The elder Pierre-Esprit Radisson, according to Dionne, was the father of Elizabeth Radisson, who has been put down by some writers as the daughter of our explorer and by others as his sister. She married Claude Jutras. It was the elder Pierre-Esprit Radisson, not our voyageur, that Madeleine Henault married, if Dionne be correct.

Radisson's *Journal* seems to bear out the position taken by Dionne. He mentions his parents at Three Rivers, and his sisters, but does not mention having a wife in New France. Besides, Dionne says that Sébastien-Hayet Radisson, our voyageur's father, lived at St. Malo, in Brittany, before coming to New France, whereas the Pierre-Esprit Radisson who married Madeleine Henault belonged to a parish in Paris before settling in New France. As Radisson was very young when Three Rivers became his home, it is reasonable to suppose that his parish and his father's parish in France were identical; and if they were, then there must have been two men named Pierre-Esprit Radisson at Three Rivers, and the elder may have been the godfather of Chouart's child in April, 1659.

On the whole, therefore, it cannot be said that there is sufficient ground for rejecting Radisson's statement that this voyage to the Lake Superior country took two years, and that during it he and Groseilliers visited the waters of Hudson Bay. There is contemporary authority for this position. Noël Jéréme, in his *Hudson Bay Relation*, states that Groseilliers not only penetrated to Hudson Bay, but to Manitoba as well. That he did go to Hudson Bay from Lake Superior is indicated by the fact that Pigeon River, near Grand Portage, on the north shore of Lake Superior, bore his name on several of the early maps.² It was the first time that white men reached Hudson Bay by an inland route.

¹ Sulte, *History of the French Canadians*.

² Including Franquelin's, 1688.

It would be well for the memory of Pierre-Esprit Radisson if his narrative of his first voyage west were as unimpeachable as that of his second voyage west—the last one. The claim that he and Groseilliers were the first white men to reach the upper Mississippi River is based upon his account of his first voyage. This voyage took three years and two months, according to Radisson, and if it took place at all, it must have been at a period previous to the journey to the Lake Superior country, from which Radisson and Groseilliers returned in August, 1660. Radisson says in several different ways that it preceded the Lake Superior and Hudson Bay voyage; and besides, we know that the two men were otherwise engaged after 1660.

The date generally given for Radisson's arrival in New France is May 24, 1651. Groseilliers had preceded him at least ten years. The year after Radisson's arrival in New France, as he himself states, he was captured by the Mohawks while he was hunting in the vicinity of Three Rivers, and his captors took him to their village, where he was adopted by an aged chieftain. Not long afterwards he attempted to escape, he and an Algonquin Indian killing three Mohawks with whom they were hunting, but he was recaptured and subjected to excruciating torture. His Indian parents had difficulty in saving his life. In October, 1653, he fled to the Dutch at Albany, at that time called Fort Orange. At that place he met a French Jesuit whom the Iroquois had captured, and he says that the Jesuit assisted him. Père Poncet, in his own *Relation*,¹ states that he was captured by the Mohawks in August, 1653; that shortly afterwards he was delivered, and that while at Fort Orange "a young man taken at Three Rivers by the Iroquois and ransomed by the Hollanders" called upon him and said that he would go to confession the next day. Thus Père Poncet not only corroborates what Radisson says about his escape from captivity in the Mohawk country, which he calls his first voyage, but he fixes the time of that captivity. From Albany Radisson went to Manhattan, now New York, whence he sailed for Holland, thence going to France. He returned to Three Rivers in May, 1654.

The next voyage that he describes, likewise an individual experience, he made as a member of the little band of Frenchmen which went to the Onondaga country to guard the Jesuits Paul Ragueneau and François Dupéron. He describes the manner in which the wonderful escape of the garrison was planned and effected after it became known that the Iroquois were plotting

¹ *Jesuit Relations*, 1653.

to kill all, and he distinctly states that he went back to the French settlements with the other colonists to the Onondaga country. This party returned in April, 1658. If Radisson's account of the voyage to Lake Superior and Hudson Bay, from which they returned in August, 1660, be correct, the two men must have started west within two or three months after Radisson's return from the Onondaga country in the early spring of 1658.

What, in view of these facts, becomes of Radisson's narrative of the first western voyage, the one during which they reached the upper Mississippi River? He asserts that this voyage took place between the mission to the Onondagas and the voyage to Lake Superior, but we have seen that the voyage to Lake Superior, according to Radisson's own statement, corroborated by the *Jesuit Relations* and the *Journal of the Jesuits*, followed closely upon the heels of Radisson's return from the Onondaga country. Radisson's third voyage—the first one to the west—did not take place when he says that it did, and that it ever took place may well be doubted. Radisson has impeached his own testimony.

Another interesting question arises: Were Radisson and Groseilliers the two nameless Frenchmen, mentioned in the *Jesuit Relations* of 1656, who went west beyond Lake Michigan, and visited the Maskouten Indians on the upper Fox River, Wisconsin, between 1654 and 1656?

It is a singular fact that Radisson's whereabouts during that period are unaccounted for. There is a blank in the record of his life between May, 1654, when he returned from his captivity among the Mohawks, and early in 1657, when he says that he went to the Onondaga country. It is also a singular fact that the whereabouts of Groseilliers cannot be accounted for from February, 1654, when, according to Sulte, he was sergeant-major of the garrison at Three Rivers, to September 29, 1656, when he was again at Three Rivers.

When Radisson returned from France early in the spring of 1654, he found that Groseilliers had married his sister Margaret the summer before. The two men at once formed that mutual friendship which is perhaps the brightest spot in their checkered careers. It is possible that they resolved upon a voyage of discovery to the far west and that they are the two nameless Frenchmen of whom the *Jesuit Relations* of 1656 speak. Sulte is quite confident that such is the case, but the question is most complicated.

The *Relations* state that the two nameless Frenchmen left

Quebec on August 6, 1654, in company with a troop of Ottawas. Radisson says that he and Groseilliers left about the middle of June (no year given), but he contradicts his own statement as to the time of the year at which they left when he says that they picked blackberries "not full ripe" before they reached Lake Nipissing, which they must have reached by July 1 if they left in the middle of June. Blackberries ripen in the upper lake country about September 1. The two nameless Frenchmen, whose journey began on August 6, must have reached the Lake Nipissing district just before blackberries were entirely ripe, but Radisson and Groseilliers, if they started west in the middle of June, would have found very green blackberries when they reached that section.

Radisson states that on this voyage they made almost a complete circuit of Lake Huron, soon passing the place where the Jesuit missions among the Hurons had been, and that afterward they came to a large island where they found some Hurons. It is generally asserted that this island is Grand Manitoulin. But to go from the northeastern coast of Michigan to that island would be dangerous, the distance between the nearest points being about forty miles across open water, more than a day's journey in a canoe; and besides, not only was Grand Manitoulin out of their way, but they would almost be doubling their tracks by going to it. Speaking of this island, Radisson says: "You must know that we passed a strait some three leagues beyond that place. The wildmen give it a name; it is another lake, but not so big as that we passed before." The strait seems to be that of Michilimackinac, and the other lake is apparently Lake Michigan. In this case the large island must be Bois Blanc, which has a shore line of about thirty-five miles. What makes all this significant is that in 1654 the fugitive Hurons were really in the Michilimackinac country, where Radisson says that he found them.

Our two Frenchmen, like the nameless Frenchmen of 1654-1656, visited the Pottawatamies and the Maskoutens, the latter in the interior of Wisconsin. Radisson and Groseilliers, like the two nameless Frenchmen, were delayed in returning the first spring by the Indians. Their return, likewise, caused great joy in the colony, and salvos of artillery were also fired in their honor from the battlements of Quebec. We have already observed that the whereabouts of Radisson and Groseilliers from 1654 to 1656 can be accounted for in no other way than by making them identical with the two nameless Frenchmen; and, moreover, Radisson and Groseilliers, if they were the two nameless Frenchmen, would have

had a year in which to rest, after their return, as Radisson says that they did.

Radisson himself furnishes a formidable argument against the theory that he and Groseilliers were the two nameless Frenchmen of 1654-1656. In addition to placing the first voyage west immediately before the second western voyage, he states that the former took three years. In another place he says, speaking of this voyage, that two years had elapsed, and that he and Groseilliers would not be able to return to the French settlements for another year. And near the end of his narrative of the voyage he says that it had taken three years and two months. Hence it cannot be, as some writers have tried to make it appear, that he wrote three years by mistake. The voyage of the two nameless Frenchmen took exactly two years.¹

Radisson wrote his journal in 1665, after he had gone over to the English service; and if, instead of his third voyage's being a fabrication from beginning to end, he and Groseilliers were the two nameless Frenchmen, he added some notes about countries that he had never seen, and lengthened the time that it took to make the voyage so that it would correspond with the additional field that the voyage covered on paper. He contradicts himself as to the time when the first voyage west began, if it really did begin at all; and if he added two months to the beginning of the journey, he would not have hesitated to add a year to the end. His object, whether the first voyage is a fabrication in whole or simply in part, was to get as much prestige as possible in England. His journal was written years before Joliet and Marquette's discovery; hence his story did not spring from their discovery or from a desire to steal their fame.

There are other arguments against the theory that Radisson and Groseilliers were the two nameless Frenchmen of 1654-1656. Radisson says that he had five hundred Indians with him when he returned from his first western voyage; no authority mentions more than three hundred in connection with the two nameless explorers. Radisson does not mention in his journal the great and populous nation of the Illinois, which the nameless Frenchmen described to the Jesuits. Radisson writes that, after arriving at Three Rivers, he led five hundred Indians against the Iroquois, and dispersed them; but the battle is not recorded elsewhere. Radisson says that, in returning to their country, the western Indians had no encounter with the enemy, but the Indians who accompanied the nameless Frenchmen to the French settlements

¹ *Jesuit Relations*, 1656.

were attacked by Iroquois upon their return journey, and Father Garreau, who was going west with them, was mortally wounded during the encounter. It should be borne in mind, however, that in the order in which Radisson places his first voyage west, the killing of Father Garreau would have been too old an incident for him to use.

It is impossible to decipher clearly Radisson's account of his third voyage—his first western journey. He mentions Sault Ste. Marie,—of course not by that name,—and he appears to have spent a winter near the mouth of Green Bay, with the Pottawatamies, and another winter with the Christinos near the outlet of Lake Superior. He evidently claims to have gone down the Mississippi River many hundred miles, probably as far as Joliet and Marquette did, for he speaks of going to the river, describing it in unmistakable terms; and he also speaks of going to a country where it never snowed nor froze, where two crops were raised in one year, where he heard of Spanish ships upon salt water (the Gulf of Mexico), and where he saw articles that the Indians had, including beads, which indicated the presence of Spaniards at no great distance. How he approached the Mississippi is very far from being plain.

The writer thinks that it is possible that Radisson and Groseillers were the two nameless Frenchmen of 1654-1656, but that, even if they were, Radisson's narrative of the voyage is virtually worthless; for, as much of it must have been fabricated, none of it can be implicitly believed except so far as the *Jesuit Relations* substantiate it. Radisson's claim to the discovery of the upper Mississippi River must be rejected on account of this uncertainty.

There is a dispute as to the route that Radisson and Groseillers took in going west. M. Dionne of Quebec, as well as M. Prud'homme of Manitoba,¹ assert that they went by way of lakes Ontario and Erie, passing Niagara Falls and Detroit, on their second voyage west. This is a mistake, due to Radisson's exaggerated description of a waterfall that they passed, and which these writers thought to have been Niagara Falls. The actual route was the one that Jean Nicolet had taken years before,²—up the Ottawa, thence to Lake Nipissing, down French River to Georgian Bay, and thence west. The river of the meadows which Radisson mentions is the Ottawa River, which, between the time when it ceased to be known as the Grand River of the Algonquins—the

¹ *Historical Notes on the Life of P. E. Radisson*, by L. A. Prud'homme, St. Boniface, Manitoba,—a most excellent epitome of Radisson's narratives.

² In 1634, when he went up the Fox River, Wisconsin, and visited the Maskoutens.

name that Champlain and Father Sagard gave it—and the time when it received its present name, was known as the River of the Prairies, which word in French means about the same as meadows. Radisson's lake of the castors is Lake Nipissing, and the name that he gave it was derived either from the fact that the Amikoue (Castor or Beaver) Indians lived in that region, or from there having been at one time an abundance of castors in the lake. The river of the sorcerers, as Radisson calls it, is, of course, French River, along which dwelt the Nipissing Indians, who were called Sorcerers by the French. Radisson's "first great lake" is Lake Huron.

Radisson and Groseilliers were certainly two of the most enterprising and intrepid explorers that ever set out from New France, the home of the *voyageur* and of the *coureur des bois*. Radisson's false statements about their first voyage, while they materially impair his personal reputation, cannot greatly lessen their fame as explorers. They were the first white men to reach Lake Superior; they were the first explorers of northwestern Wisconsin and of Minnesota, and perhaps the pioneer explorers, by an inland route, of Hudson Bay. They were the founders of the great Hudson Bay Company, which fact alone makes them worthy of a permanent place in history.

HENRY COLIN CAMPBELL.

THE WHIGS OF COLONIAL NEW YORK

A REMARKABLE feature of political life in the colony of New York during the eighteenth century is the leadership of lawyers, especially upon the popular side. That political initiative which was assumed in other colonies by the rural squires, by rich merchants, or by clergymen, lay in New York in the hands of the advocates. The DeLanceys at the head of the party of prerogative were pitted against Smiths and Livingstons, Whig champions of the people. To them all, and to their familiarity with English law and history, was due the systematic expansion of powers of the popular organ of government in the colony. To them was also due an unusual adroitness in clever partisan management in petty as well as in great affairs, as when the DeLanceys reduced Chief-Justice Morris' salary by one-half, or as when the tearful eloquence of the elder Smith diminished the poll for the aristocratic candidate by ensuring the disfranchisement of the Jews.

In numbers and in learning, though not in shrewdness, the aristocratic DeLanceys were overmatched by their opponents. It has often been remarked that a Presbyterian community breeds able lawyers. Cadwalader Colden was not the only Tory politician to observe with some asperity that all the popular leaders of his day were both lawyers and Presbyterians. That supreme conception of law and justice which is inherent in the creed of Calvin was the mainspring of the whole popular party in New York, just as it was the mainspring of the whole polity in New England. Without this leaven, New York colonial politics would have lacked form and direction and would have been little more than a puerile scramble of petty oligarchies.

The importance of the personal influence of single individuals is as marked in this period of New York's history as it was in the seventeenth century; but politics became, in the eighteenth century, far more a family inheritance than it had been in the former time. The lawyers of eminence founded powerful families of their own, or made connections with the large and wealthy merchant clans of Dutch and English blood. Some of them did both. The DeLancey blood blended with that of half of the aristocratic

families of the first rank along the Hudson valley. The Livingstons, Van Cortlandts, and Beekmans were equally intertwined. Rival oligarchies like these might play the part of Florentine Bianchi and Neri, but they were likely to combine against a governor who was excessively arrogant, as Cosby discovered, or against a populace which dared to elevate leaders of its own, as the Sons of Liberty realized.

The lines of cleavage between political parties and religious denominations were virtually identical, and the mutual animosity of the two English churches, Episcopalian and Presbyterian, was the most potent political force in the colony. In the outlying districts the unfriendly denominations were not brought into close juxtaposition. The Anglicans possessed scarcely a foothold on the upper Hudson. In and around Albany, Dutch and English Presbyterianism reigned supreme, and the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of Ulster County were almost as unanimous as the Yankee farmers of Long Island.

But in New York City there was a root of bitterness, which grew in the sight of all men, and which defied eradication. For the beginning of this bitterness Leisler and his partisans were responsible. For the worst features of its development, Presbyterians and Episcopalians were blameworthy. The Anglican Church was very small, embracing less than one-tenth of the population, but the constant favor of the royal governors gave it social prestige and the allegiance of the official class. An overwhelming majority of its members, as in all the northern colonies, adhered to the aristocratic or Tory party. Strong in wealth and in executive support, the Episcopalians took advantage of a dubious law to claim a semi-establishment in four counties. They laid forcible hands on Presbyterian churches and parsonages, and they persecuted and prosecuted Presbyterian ministers for unlicensed preaching. They prevented the Presbyterian church of the city from securing incorporation, so that the latter was compelled to deed its property to the Scottish Kirk in order to acquire a legal status.

The Presbyterians, though strong in numbers, were poor, and therefore weak in social and political influence, but they surpassed their Episcopalian opponents in boldness of purpose and in vigor of invective. The spirits of Laud and Cromwell, however quiescent in England, were still as militant as ever in the colonies, and the descendants of the Puritans looked upon their Episcopalian neighbors as the servants of the power which would gladly strangle both civil and religious liberty. The balance of power belonged to the Dutch Reformed Church, more numerous than the Pres-

byterians everywhere except upon Long Island, and as well provided with families of wealth and distinction as the Episcopalian community. In spirit and polity it was harmonious with the Presbyterian denomination, and equally opposed to the Anglican communion. As in the days of Leisler, however, the sentiment of caste was stronger than the Calvinist unity, and the major part of the wealthy Dutch families, albeit a small minority of the community, preferred to array themselves socially and politically with the congenial Anglican aristocracy. The non-conformist body as a whole, whether Presbyterian or Dutch Reformed, was inclined to resent their conduct as treacherous. Under a freehold suffrage, however, the wealthy families could by combinations exert a disproportionate influence at the elections, and direct the course of public affairs unless overthrown by some unusual agitation. In such social affiliations lay the strength of the DeLanceys.

In 1748, the irritation between the two English churches was inflamed by the scheme of Rev. Dr. Secker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, to enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity throughout the English colonies. The desire of some resident Anglican clergy for an American bishop or house of bishops increased the inflammation. Injudicious management concentrated all the contending acrid humors upon the project for the foundation of a college in New York City. Leading members of the Anglican communion were among the most prominent promoters of this plan. They naturally wished to have a school for their children under the influence of the Church, as Yale and Harvard, in New England, were entirely controlled by denominations unfriendly to the Episcopalians. But in order to provide an endowment for the college, the Assembly had authorized a public lottery. The proceeds from it amounted, in 1751, to £3443. The majority in the Assembly, consisting of the followers of James DeLancey, then created a board of ten trustees, of whom seven were Episcopalians, two belonged to the Dutch Church, and one, William Livingston, was a Presbyterian. These trustees outlined a charter which would secure to the Episcopalians the perpetual control of the college. Immediately there was an outcry from the non-conformists. It was contended that a school fostered by public grants should avoid an unreserved identification with any one of the rival churches. The common people were quite ripe for the suggestion that the Secker proposition, the plan for a new college, and the aristocratic and Tory sympathies of the DeLancey party were all but parts of one great whole. A political party was rapidly solidified, when that suggestion was made by William Livingston.

This young man, whom this agitation developed into the most prominent leader of the popular party, was a grandson of cunning Robert, who had been Leisler's foe and the first lord of the Livingston Manor. Born in Albany, in November, 1723, William Livingston was reared in luxury, and, before he had completed his fourteenth year, followed three of his older brothers to Yale College. Upon his graduation, in 1741, he devoted himself to the study of law under the tuition of two veteran Whig advocates and leaders, Messrs. James Alexander and William Smith, sr. In their offices, Livingston joined a group of young lawyers who derived in common their culture from Yale, and their legal and political prepossessions from Smith and Alexander. Mr. Alexander's son, William, who, under the title of Lord Stirling, was prominent upon the American side in the early years of the Revolution, was a comrade of the Livingston brothers. William Livingston's most intimate associates were William Smith, jr., the historian; the latter's cousin, William Peartree Smith; and John Morin Scott, who was graduated from Yale in 1746. In ecclesiastical matters, the Livingstons and their comrades were sturdy Calvinists, and William Livingston was more strict in principle and in observance than most of those who were his social equals. The aristocratic clique was well aware of the latent possibilities in this promising legal coterie. The younger Smith inherited his father's legal abilities, and Livingston acquired fame as a wit and a scholar. The pride of his family forbade that absorption in the plebeian study of art which he at first contemplated, but he relieved the tedium of his profession with the mechanical arts, with the practice of agriculture, and with literary composition. A native impatience and acerbity of temper predisposed him to satire, and his earliest prose essays were pasquinades. So prone was he in early life to indulge in sweeping criticism, that a young lady of his acquaintance, with some allusion to his length of lean body, fastened upon him the nickname of "the whipping-post." Livingston drew his own picture as "a long-nosed, long-chinned, ugly-looking fellow."

The sober second thought corrected the impulse to petulance, and experience ripened in his disposition an abundant measure of sweet and healthy independence. Moral courage was his predominant quality. If he had been more pliant, less truthful and less impartial, he would have been more famous as a political leader, and might never have surrendered the leadership of New York democracy into less worthy hands. Before he had definitely declared his political preferences, one of the DeLanceys said to

him familiarly: "Will, you would be the cleverest fellow in the world, if you were only one of us." "I will try to be a clever fellow," was the blunt answer, "without being one of you." The death of Livingston's father, in 1749, probably removed a restraint from the son's political freedom, for Mr. Philip Livingston, although he had never bowed the knee to DeLancey, was the last of his family to sympathize with the aristocratic and Tory notions of political conduct.

William Livingston and his friends, ambitious to leaven the lump around them, formed early in 1752 an association called "The Whig Club," which assembled weekly at "The King's Arms" tavern, and drank to the immortal memories of Oliver Cromwell and John Hampden. Moved by such inspiration, William Livingston began on the 30th of November of the same year, the publication of *The Independent Reflector*, a paper founded—so Livingston said in the prospectus—"to oppose superstition, bigotry, priestcraft, tyranny, servitude, public mismanagement and dishonesty in office." The youthful fervor with which the editor began to fulfil this comprehensive programme delighted his friends of the popular party, but polite society in general stood aghast. The mayor of the city urged the grand jury to indict for libel. The Episcopal clergy denounced Livingston as a libertine and infidel, and one declared from the pulpit that the editor of the *Reflector* was the Gog and Magog foretold in the Apocalypse. This discovery Livingston gravely accepted as a compliment, in succeeding issues of his journal.

As soon as the question of sectarian influence in the new college was fairly broached, Livingston transformed *The Reflector* into a battery from which the heroes of the Whig Club poured a raking fire into the history, dogmas, and aristocratic sympathies of the Established Church of England. Upon their flag they inscribed the legend "Non-sectarian education." The answering volley was fired by the Anglican clergy of the city from the columns of Hugh Gaines' *Mercury*, which was the official and aristocratic organ. In the ardor of combat the controversy ranged over the whole field of religious belief and practice. Livingston became almost as excited, though not so incoherent, as the clerical interpreter of the visions at Patmos. He scandalized the devout churchmen by printing what he called his "creed," significantly framed in thirty-nine articles. Some of the tersest and most pungent of these may illustrate the character of the fray.

"Article 7. I believe that to defend the Christian religion is one thing, and to knock a man on the head for being of a different opinion is another thing."

"Article 13. I believe that riches, ornaments, and ceremonies were assumed by the churches for the same reason that garments were invented by our first parents."

"Article 17. I believe that our faith, like our stomachs, may be overcharged, especially if we are prohibited to chew what we are commanded to swallow."

It is not strange that Rev. Samuel Johnson read such sentences as these with just that consecrated misunderstanding to which such excellent men are often liable. He wrote in melancholy fashion to Doctor Secker, of the circulation of this "pernicious" literature among the youth of New York, and lamented that these young Absaloms were trying, as he phrased it, "to wrest the new college out of the Church's hands, and make it a sort of freethinking, latitudinarian seminary." Pressure from the upper circles terrified the printers into a refusal of service to *The Independent Reflector*, which was accordingly discontinued in November, 1753. The enemy's guns being thus silenced, the majority of the trustees considered an offer from the wardens and vestry of Trinity Church to give to the college a convenient site, on condition that the President should always be a communicant in the Church of England, and that the Anglican liturgy should always be used in the religious exercises of the institution.

The Episcopalian trustees voted to request Acting Governor James DeLancey to affix the great seal to a charter based on these provisions. Mr. DeLancey, under irresistible pressure, consented, but his heart misgave him, for he was far-sighted, and did not, like his friends, despise the temper of the plebeian multitude. Livingston then protested that, as the funds of the institution were obtained under the authority of the Assembly, no incorporation, which was not sanctioned by that body, could convey the control of the lottery money. Aided by his chief lieutenants, Smith and Scott, he conducted on this issue a new appeal to the people, in the shape of public meetings, personal canvassings, and a rain of public letters, petitions, and addresses. They even bought their way with vulgar money into one corner of the hitherto unimpeachable *Gaines' Mercury*. The discussion overleaped the field of dogmas and rituals. The suit of Presbyterianism *vs.* Episcopacy was merged in the cause of the common people *vs.* DeLancey aristocracy. "Livingston, Smith, and Scott," wrote the irate Tory squire, Jones, "were a triumvirate who were all Presbyterians by profession and republicans by principle, determined if possible to pull down Church and State and to raise their own government and religion upon the ruins." So great was the excitement and

so numerous signed were the popular petitions against delivering the money to the trustees that the aristocratic politicians did not dare to take final action until December, 1755, three years after the struggle began.

Although Mr. DeLancey was still in the executive chair, and although his partisans fully controlled the Council and the Assembly, the Livingston campaign won success, for it forced a compromise. The college was surrendered to the Episcopalians, but one-half of its funds was diverted to the erection of a new jail and pesthouse, of which the city was much in need. The temper in which the arrangement was made is revealed in the remark of the elder Smith, who, as a councillor, gave his vote for the bargain with a word of gratulation that the money was "to be divided between the two pesthouses."

This long controversy accomplished much more than the crippling of King's, now Columbia, College. It wrought a political revolution. The verdict of the people at large was rendered at the septennial elections of 1758, when, for the first time since the era of the Zenger trial, James DeLancey and his supporters failed to retain a popular majority at the polls. The Livingston group dominated the new Assembly and consolidated a Whig party which bore their family name. Lieutenant-Governor James DeLancey, dying soon after his humiliating defeat, bequeathed the leadership of his faction to his son of the same name, and left his executive office to his ancient Tory rival, Cadwalader Colden, an unbending aristocrat of the old school who scorned the popularity which DeLancey loved. For the next decade, the houses of Livingston and DeLancey were the Percies and Nevilles of the province of New York. "From this time," writes the historian Smith, "we shall distinguish the opposition (*i.e.* to the upholders of prerogative) under the name of the Livingston party, though it did not always proceed from motives approved of by that family."

That stalwart old Tory, Dr. Cadwalader Colden, coming down from his Ulster County farm at the age of seventy-three years to do battle again in the cause of prerogative, took the measure of his opponents in more forcible language. He wrote: "For some years past three popular lawyers, educated in Connecticut, who have strongly imbibed the independent principles of that country, . . . make use of every artifice they can invent to calumniate the administration in every exercise of the prerogative. . . . They get the applause of the mob by their licentious harangues, and by propagating the doctrine that all authority is derived from the consent of the people." Judge Jones also attributed the seditious

tendencies of Livingston, Smith, and Scott to the influence of that New Haven Nazareth out of which they had come. "They were educated," he said, "at Yale College in Connecticut, then and still a nursery of sedition, of faction, and of republicanism."

The political gospel which to Tories like Jones and Colden smacked of republicanism, was really the dilettante democracy of the school of Edmund Burke. Livingston and his friends were aristocratic Whigs, equally anxious to clip the pinions of ambitious royalty and to curb the insolence of the unlettered mob. The Livingston party in New York did, as Colden said, cherish the horrid Connecticut doctrine that "all authority is derived from the people," but they were quite content with the narrow English definition of the term "people." With Edmund Burke, they thought that a parliamentary assembly of aristocratic representatives of the people was an ideally perfect form of government. Livingston's management of the college controversy showed that he realized the political importance of the public opinion of the multitude, but he expected to use King Demos as a Greek chorus and not to introduce him as a principal character in the play.

The Assembly which was elected after the death of George II. was overwhelmingly Livingstonian, and it locked horns at once with Lieutenant-Governor Colden. Because the DeLanceys hated that officer, the aristocratic faction in the Council and elsewhere offered little opposition to the triumphant Whigs. Mr. Benjamin Pratt, the Boston Tory who was indiscreet enough to accept the chief justice's commission upon the tenure of "during the King's pleasure" instead of "during good behavior," went home after two sessions of the supreme court, without receiving a penny of salary. On this subject the Assembly began in 1762 a series of addresses to the King, which were the most elaborate and courageous state papers that had up to that time emanated from any legislative body on this continent.

Against the Grenville project of colonial taxation, the memorials sent to the King and to both Houses of Parliament in 1763 and again in 1764 were supported by Livingstons and DeLanceys alike. The address of 1764, the work of Philip Livingston, was so bold in its claim of "freedom from taxes not granted by ourselves" that no member of Parliament dared present the document to those houses. Governor Colden wrote a long letter to the lords of trade and plantations to explain how such an "undutiful and indecent Address" could have been adopted by an Assembly under his government. At the same time that "undutiful" body chose the first colonial committee of correspondence on

the continent, a committee consisting of two Livingston Whigs, two DeLancey aristocrats, and one neutral. It was William Bayard, one of the DeLancey politicians, who travelled to Boston to spur the milder-tempered General Court of Massachusetts to more defiant action. This crafty policy of the aristocratic group was not entirely due to dislike of Colden, or to a craving for popularity. Aristocrats and Whigs were equally averse to paying taxes, and when the flame of rebellion against the Stamp Act flared up in 1765, the DeLanceys were quite willing to see the Livingstons fan the fire. The Whig leaders undertook to repeat the tactics of 1753. The triumvirate organized the third estate of mechanics and farmers more systematically than before, and, like Otis, Warren, and Adams at Boston, created a public opinion irresistible in the streets but feeble in the drawing-rooms. Colonel Barré's impassioned reply to Townshend in the House of Commons furnished a noble name for these sprouting associations, and the summer's harvest of 1765 was a legion of "Sons of Liberty." Then suddenly the Livingston gentry discovered that they had summoned from the vasty deep a spirit that they could not master. The men, who, as moving spirits of the Sons of Liberty, were expected to be merely file-leaders of the Whig chorus, pushed the Livingstons aside, and assumed the batons of command. A new king had arisen who knew not Joseph.

As the first of November approached, on which day the Stamp Act was to go into operation, it seemed inevitable that the resolute radicals and the equally sturdy old Governor Colden would bring the struggle to actual bloodshed. Colden refitted the fort, trained the cannon on the city, filled the fort with soldiers from Crown Point, and lodged the stamps safely under the shelter of their guns. The Sons of Liberty, on the other hand, appointed the first popular committee of correspondence on the continent, adopted the first non-importation agreement on the continent, promised mob law to any man who should use the stamped paper, and for five days, November 1-5, rioted before the walls of the fort, hanging Colden in effigy, sacking and burning his property and that of the commandant of the garrison. They finally planned to assault the fort on the night of Guy Fawkes' Day, the 5th of November. The Livingstons had at first tried to ride the storm and direct it, but they failed ignominiously. Scott joined the mob, but the others recoiled from the disloyal talk of their partisans and were horror-stricken at the notion of firing on the English flag and uniform. Judge Robert Livingston was even threatened by his former henchmen because he denounced the turbulence of the

Sons of Liberty. Under the impending danger of actual bloodshed, the gentry of both factions hastened to Colden and succeeded in patching up a compromise which satisfied the radicals and at least saved the dignity of the governor.

The chasm between the two wings of the popular party yawned wider as the months rolled on. All the people professed to approve of the non-importation policy, but neither Livingston Whigs nor DeLancey Tories liked to see a gang of artisans and apprentices pose as the sole guardians of that policy. The vigilance committee of the Sons of Liberty maintained a sort of Holy Inquisition into the sales and purchases of every man of business, into the outgoings and incomings of private households, and into the reported opinions of individuals. A reputable merchant, Mr. Lewis Pintard, having once sent a stamped paper to Philadelphia, was summoned to promise publicly and humbly, like a whipped school-boy, that he would never do it again. To the people in wigs, lace ruffles, and silk clothes, who walked softly and fared sumptuously every day, were they Whigs or were they Tories, this yoke of the Sons of Liberty was not joyous, but grievous. They disapproved of the political and social upheaval of an artisan democracy. They were shocked by the wanton destruction of property on the night of November 1st. They were frightened by the unwonted popularity of unlearned and hitherto unknown men whose influence owed nothing to either wealth or pedigree. When the pressure was suddenly relaxed by the repeal of the act in March, 1766, there was a hidden meaning in the enthusiasm with which the people of all classes huzzaed in the streets once more for "George III., Pitt, and Liberty."

The removal of the pressure revealed also the extent of the disintegration in the Whig party. The Livingston Whigs were sent to the rear. The democratic leaders whom the Sons of Liberty had elevated from their ranks emerged from the battle in full command of the populace of the city, New York's first real democracy. Already they had changed the doctrine of "No taxation without representation" into the broader gospel of "No legislation without representation," a sentiment as obnoxious in New York as in England. All these captains of the Sons of Liberty moved far outside that comfortable social world wherein Livingstons, Philipses, Cruigers, Schuylers, and DeLanceys met on equal terms. Fifty years later the aged Aaron Burr remarked: "Very few people now realize who and what the men were that, on this side of the water, made the war of revolution inevitable." In New York they were John Lamb, a liquor dealer; Isaac Sears, popularly known as King

Sears, son of a Yankee fish-peddler, and himself in turn a sailor, privateersman, and shopkeeper; Archibald Laidly, Presbyterian minister; John Holt, printer; Alexander McDougall, milkman, sailor, privateersman, small trader, and finally merchant; Marinus Willett, soldier in the late war; and others like Gershom Mott, William Wiley, and Thomas Robinson, of whom fame has preserved little more than their names. These persons and their associates, usually men of little education and of less social prestige and dignity, but ambitious and restless, met together frequently in the long room of a tavern which they called "Hampden Hall." There they preserved the machinery of their political organization and the combustibles with which they kindled the flames of popular agitation.

The same causes that shattered the Livingston party strengthened its rival. The merchants and gentry of moderate sentiments, who constituted the greater portion of the well-to-do class in and around New York City, were alienated by the violence of the radicals, and thought to show their undoubted loyalty by voting for Tory candidates. The peaceful Dutch and German folk, who were especially disquieted by the recent tumults, discerned that the new Whig leaders were invariably Presbyterians. Misliking both the Yankee race and the Yankee church, the Dutch Reformed and the Lutherans easily saw good reason for allying themselves with aristocracy and episcopacy. Moreover, the young DeLancey surpassed even his father's dexterity in hiding oligarchy behind a mask of democracy. His adherents naturally led the dance of joy that ensued upon the repeal of the hated act. They made loud professions of allegiance to the non-importation agreements, hiding, as Colden said, for political motives, a secret aversion under an outward conformity. They were also adroit enough to widen the breach between the Sons of Liberty and the Livingston group by appealing to the latent mob prejudice against lawyers.

With the campaign cry of "No lawyers to the Assembly," a DeLancey merchant ticket swept the city in 1767. William Livingston and his friends did not abandon the struggle. The Assembly was still theirs. The Whig party of the Albany region and of eastern Long Island was intact, for there no class distinctions sundered the Sons of Liberty from the old party leaders. In 1767-1769, a revival of the project for an American Episcopate afforded to Livingston an opportunity to appeal for popular unity on the old familiar ground. The Lord-Bishop of Llandaff, in a sermon, called the New Englanders "infidels and barbarians." Governor Moore and his Council in New York again refused to

incorporate the Presbyterian church in the city. A petition for bishops was formally despatched across the water by the Episcopal clergy of New York and New Jersey.

The Whig politicians, as before, smelt Tory politics in the scheme; the Presbyterian ministers detected a still more sulphurous odor in it, and one of the latter in New Jersey so far forgot himself as to call the Episcopal Church "that rag of the whore of Babylon." William Livingston entered the lists against the English prelate, and received therefor a formal vote of thanks from the Connecticut consociation of churches, by the hand of its secretary, his own friend, Rev. Noah Welles. One of the wits of the DeLancey party parodied this classical tribute in verses which ended thus:—

"March on, brave Will, and rear our Babel
On language so unanswerable,
Give Church and State a hearty thump,
And knock down truth with falsehoods plump;
So flat shall fall their churches' fair stones,
Felled by another Praise God Barebones.
Signed with consent of all the tribe
By Noah Welles, our fasting scribe."

The Livingston effort to cement their broken wings with anti-Episcopal glue was a failure. In January, 1769, Governor Moore dissolved the Assembly for its contumacy in refusing supplies for the soldiery, and in disobeying the royal prohibition against political correspondence,—especially with Massachusetts. Both Whigs and Tories strained every nerve to win the ensuing elections. The DeLanceys were clever enough, on the one hand, to intensify the opposition between the Sons of Liberty and those rich lawyers, the Livingstons, and on the other hand, to excite the merchant class against the Whig alliance with the mob. The Livingstons appealed for the verdict of popular approval. The character of their hopes in New York City was naïvely revealed in Peter R. Livingston's letter to Philip Schuyler: "There is a great deal in good management of the votes. Our people are in high spirits, and if there is not fair play shown, there will be bloodshed, as we have by far the best part of the Bruisers on our side, who are determined to use force, if *they* (the DeLanceys) use any foul play."

The good man's confidence in the Bruisers was misplaced. The majority of the Sons of Liberty repudiated the Whig nabobs altogether. The Tory-Episcopalian-merchant-DeLancey combi-

nation received two-thirds of all the votes in New York City. Barely half a dozen Whig members found a place in the new Assembly. Among them, the only prominent figures were those of Philip Schuyler, from the extreme North, and of George Clinton, from the extreme West. From that time until the outbreak of the war, the balance of voters in Southern New York inclined strongly to the aristocratic side, and ultra-loyalty was a fashionable sentiment. The moderate Whigs of birth and breeding had before been sent to the rear of the popular army. Now they retired from it altogether, and the Sons of Liberty confiscated their effects. Of the famous triumvirate, Scott cast in his lot with Lamb and Sears. Smith and Livingston, like their comrades, the Jays, the Morrises, the Franklins, Randolphs, and Rutledges, stood apart, silently and unhappily watching the course of events, until the outbreak of hostilities forced them to choose between loyalty and rebellion. William Livingston, disheartened by the violence and open disloyalty of the Sons of Liberty, moved in 1772 to New Jersey and disappeared from New York politics. The events of 1774 threw him, like most of the moderate Whigs, into a renewed association with the Sons of Liberty, and as governor and statesman, William Livingston was the foremost man in New Jersey from 1776 until his death in 1790.

William Smith moved in an opposite direction. Unable to abandon his allegiance to England, he was hated as an apostate by the Sons of Liberty, became a Tory refugee, and died Chief Justice of Canada. Until rebellion blurred all prospects of peace, it was Smith's hope that the agitation would result in a continental colonial parliament, subject to the English Crown, but competent to decide all domestic affairs. This was also the expectation of Benjamin Franklin and of William Livingston. The moderate sentiment of both parties would have acclaimed such a solution of the difficulty. Only the tactless persistence of an English ministry and monarch could have alienated such allegiance as these gentry owned to the mother country. A little more friendly diplomacy in the treatment of these colonies, and English sovereignty might have rested on a foundation that not all the radical malcontents from Boston to Savannah would have been able to shake.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

WESTERN STATE-MAKING IN THE REVOLUTIONARY ERA

II

ALTHOUGH in western Pennsylvania the agitation subsided for a time, in the West Virginia region the ferment went on. To understand the situation it is necessary to recall the proceedings in Congress. On November 3, 1781, a committee recommended the acceptance of New York's cession, covering a considerable portion of Virginia's claim; and also recommended that Congress should refuse to give to Virginia the guaranty of her remaining territory, which she had demanded as the price of ceding her lands beyond the Ohio. It further recommended, that when Congress should come into possession of the tract, the claim of the Indiana company be confirmed, and the Vandalia proprietors reimbursed in lands for their actual expenditures; but it denied the latter grant as a whole, as incompatible with the interests, government, and policy of the United States. The report was a distinct blow to Virginia, and it marks the highwater point of efforts at Congressional control of regions like West Virginia just west of the Alleghanies. Through the reasoning of the report ran the theory that the crown lands, that is, all the lands beyond these mountains, had passed by devolution to the whole United States. In accepting New York's cession, Congress clothed herself with the additional title of that State. The report was not acted on until later, but the rumor of it (sometimes exaggerated into the statement that Congress had definitely taken the crown lands) spread through the West, and increased the projects for states and the appeals to Congress. In the summer of 1782 heated debates occurred in Congress over its power respecting the organization of the trans-Alleghany lands. Some argued for the right of Congress to take possession of this country, and to take the petitioning Western settlers by the hand, and admit them as new states. It was intimated that Virginia contemplated the formation of the Western country into distinct subordinate governments, and the sending out of lieutenant-governors to rule them—a repetition of the colonial policy of Great Britain, and likely to bring about another revolution. Virginia

was threatened by one speaker with forcible division into two or more distinct and independent states.¹ In the fall of 1782 Congress accepted New York's cession, and there matters rested until the next autumn.²

With so critical a situation in Congress, it is not surprising that Virginia settlers beyond the mountains began to sell their lands for low prices, and to take up new claims, expecting to be supported by Congress. Within a few days after they gave the news of this movement, the same newspapers printed a petition³ to the Virginia Assembly, asking for a new state beyond the mountains. The settlers pointed with pride to their loyalty to the revolutionary cause even while they were suffering hardships in their internal government; and they declared at some length their respect for the federal government. Said the memorialists: "We are, indeed, erected into separate States upon the declaration of our independency: but the very existence of those states separately considered, was necessarily depending upon the success of our federal Union." "Every wise man looks through the Constitution of his own State to that of the confederation, as he walks through the particular apartments of his own house to view the situation of the whole building." An increase of states in the federal Union would, in their opinion, conduce to the strength and dignity of that Union; for, said these frontier members of the Old Dominion, "it is as possible that one state should aim at undue influence over others as that an individual should aspire after the aggrandizement of himself," and this danger an increase of states would lessen. Replying to objections drawn from their social conditions, they say: "Some of our fellow-citizens may think we are not yet able to conduct our affairs and consult our interests; but if our society is rude, much wisdom is not necessary to supply our wants, and a fool can sometimes put on his clothes better

¹ Thomson Papers, *N. Y. Hist. Colls.*, 1878, pp. 145-150.

² Madison's Observations relating to the Influence of Vermont and the Territorial Claims on the Politics of Congress, May 1, 1782 (Gilpin, I. 122), gives a good idea of the situation from a Virginia point of view, and shows the part played by the land companies and by the revolutionary State of Vermont, where the similar problem of recognizing a state, formed within the limits of other states and against their will, was involved. The *Philadelphia Independent Gazette*, of July 13 and 20, has two numbers of a series entitled: "A Philosophical Discussion on the Rights of Vermont, Kentucky, etc., to aspire to their Separate Stations of Independency among Sovereign States on Revolutionary Principles, by a Revolutionist." These numbers (all I have access to) were chiefly vituperative, and the underlying thought is expressed in the title. The Vermont example was made use of in connection with Western projects. Ramsey, *Tennessee*, 312.

³ Draper Colls., Newspaper Extracts III., *Maryland Journal*, December 9 and December 20, 1783.

than a wise man can do it for him. We are not against hearing council; but we attend more to our feelings than to the argumentation of others." They add that the whole authority of the state rests ultimately upon the opinions and judgments of men who are generally as void of experience as themselves. Nor in their opinion is there occasion to fear the results of a separation of the two parts of the state of Virginia: "Our nearest seaports will be among you, your readiest resources for effectual succour in case of any invasion will be to us: the fruits of our industry and temperance will be enjoyed by you, and the simplicity of our manners will furnish you with profitable lessons. In recompense for these services you will furnish our rustic inhabitants with examples of civility and politeness and supply us with conveniences which are without the reach of our labour." They ask therefore that Virginia should cede all the territory west of the Alleghany Mountains and allow the settlers to form a new government under the auspices of the American Congress. Early the next year Jefferson¹ wrote to Madison that it was for the interest of Virginia to cede the Kentucky region immediately, because the people beyond the meridian of the mouth of the Great Kanawha would "separate themselves and be joined by all our settlements beyond the Alleghany, if they are the first movers; whereas if we draw the line, those at Kentucky having their end will not interest themselves for the people of Indiana, Greenbrier, etc., who will, of course, be left to our management, and I can with certainty almost say that congress would approve of the meridian of the mouth of the Kanaway, consider it as the ultimate point to be desired from Virginia. . . . Should we not be the first movers, and the Indianians and Kentuckyians take themselves off and claim to the Alleghany, I am afraid Congress would secretly wish them well." By the Indianians, of course Jefferson means the inhabitants of the region of the old Indiana company, and it seems likely that the petition just considered came from these settlers. The reasons which Jefferson gives for retaining to the meridian of the mouth of the Great Kanawha included the following: These lands (before long to be thickly settled) would form a barrier for Virginia; and the hundred and eighty miles of barren, mountainous lands beyond would make a fine separation between her and the next state. The lead mines were there; and the improvement of the river would afford "the shortest water communication by 500 miles of any which can ever be got between the western waters and Atlantic, and of course promises us almost a monopoly of the

¹ Jefferson, *Writings*, III. 401.

western and Indian trade." Evidently the attacks of the land companies, the discontent of the settlers, and the attitude of Congress were having their effects. Virginia was beginning to perceive that she must cede something unconditionally, lest she lose all her Western settlements. Her leaders were coming to see, moreover, the importance of uniting the West and the East by internal improvements, a movement that led the way to the Constitutional Convention. Not long after Jefferson's letter Washington¹ wrote to Governor Harrison, regarding the desirability of connecting the West to Virginia by ties of interest. If Virginia improved the Potomac and Ohio route, to draw Western trade to herself, Pennsylvania was in no position to make objections, though part of the road would pass through her territory; for, said Washington, "there are in the State of Pennsylvania at least a hundred thousand souls west of Laurel Hill who are groaning under the inconveniences of a long land transportation," and Pennsylvania "must submit to the loss of so much of its trade, or hazard not only the loss of the trade but the loss of the settlements also . . . toward which there is not wanting a disposition at this moment in that part of it beyond the mountains." In the same year Washington was urging that Congress should legislate for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio. "The spirit of immigration is great," he wrote to Richard Henry Lee, "the people have got impatient; and though you cannot stop the road, it is yet in your power to mark the way; a little while and you will not be able to do either." The truth of this opinion is shown by the attempts of squatters on the western side of the Ohio to form a constitution for a new state in 1785, on the doctrine that it was a right of mankind to pass into vacant territory and there form their constitution.² But the federal troops drove off the intruders, in spite of this doctrine of squatter sovereignty, "agreeable to every constitution formed in America."

Propositions for "marking the way" were already under consideration in Congress. The policy had finally prevailed of asking cessions instead of asserting authority, and in October of 1783 Virginia had authorized a cession of her lands across the Ohio. The Vandalia Company made another struggle to secure its claim, and exhibited its New Jersey strength by inducing that state to appoint Col. George Morgan its agent, in order to bring the Vandalia claim before Congress as a claim of the state of New Jersey, and thus induce Congress to take jurisdiction

¹ Washington, *Writings*, X. 407.

² *St. Clair Papers*, II. 3-5; McMaster, III. 106, 107.

between the two states of Virginia and New Jersey, under the Articles of Confederation. But that body refused to take the matter up; accepted Virginia's cession; and passed the Ordinance of 1784.¹ It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the evolution of the territorial government for the ceded lands by Congress. The petition and proposed constitution² outlined by the army officers at Newburgh, in 1783, the steps leading to Jefferson's ordinance; Monroe's, and later reports,³ and the outcome of all this Congressional action in the Ordinance of 1787, we must pass by. But some of the features of the Ordinance of 1784 had a direct effect upon the backwoodsmen, whose attitude is under consideration, and so must be noted. This statute provided that the territory ceded or to be ceded by individual states should, whenever it should have been purchased of the Indians and offered for sale by the United States, be formed into additional states, bounded in the following manner⁴ as nearly as the cessions should admit: northwardly and southwardly by parallels of latitude, so that each state should comprise from north to south two degrees of latitude, beginning to count from the completion of 45° N. lat. Eastwardly and westwardly, the boundaries were to be the Mississippi, on the one side, and the meridian of the lowest point of the falls of the Ohio, on the other; and for the next tier of states, the same meridian was to form the boundary on the west, while to the east the boundary would be the meridian of the mouth of the Great Kanawha. The territory eastward of this last meridian between the Ohio, Lake Erie, and Pennsylvania, was to be one state in addition. Whatever territory lay beyond the completion of 45° between the meridians mentioned, was to be a part of the state adjoining it on the south; and where the Ohio cut the parallel 39°, its course to the north of that line was to be substituted for that portion of the parallel. Two things deserve particular notice in this arrangement: the rigid application of the rectangular system, with small regard for physiographic propriety;⁵ and the number of small states provided for. Jefferson's belief in the West is clearly indicated by this readiness to concede so large a share of power in Congress to the region. The agricultural West might be regarded as a natural political ally of Virginia. It is less easy to see why New England accepted the proposition.

¹ April 23. Donaldson, *Public Domain*, 147-149; Barrett, 17-27.

² Pickering, *Life of Pickering*, I. 546-549, Appendix iii.

³ Stone, *Ordinance of 1787*; Barrett, 33 *et seq.*

⁴ See map in previous number; and correct into accord with this.

⁵ See later, p. 259.

Earlier in the year a Rhode Island congressman wrote: "It is proposed to divide the country into fourteen new states in the following manner. There are to be three tiers of states: one on the Atlantic, one on the Mississippi, and a middle tier. The middle tier is to be the smallest and is to form a balance betwixt the two more powerful ones."¹

Having thus outlined the course of new state activity in one of the regions of the Western Waters, and having traced the connection between it and the Congressional legislation, we may next survey the attempts of similar nature in the Tennessee and the Kentucky regions. Here we shall have to be very brief, partly because of the limits of the paper, partly because the essential grievances and methods have been stated in connection with the first region. Moreover, the writers who have related the history of Kentucky and Tennessee have made the attempts in these settlements more familiar. One centre of disturbance on the Tennessee waters, however, has been neglected. It will be remembered that Washington county, Virginia, the region on the Holston about Abington, was economically and socially a part of the North Carolina region, on the same waters, although separated by the Virginia line; and that the mountains cut this tract off from both the parent states. Moreover, the Virginia counties of Montgomery and Greenbrier, on the tributaries of the Great Kanawha, lay in close connection with Washington county. When the rumor came to these settlements that Congress had resolved against Virginia's claim to their region, they were thrown into commotion, and Arthur Campbell, the fiery Scotch-Irishman who was county-lieutenant and justice of Washington county in Virginia, and Col. William Christian, another noted Indian fighter, brother-in-law of Patrick Henry, agreed upon a plan for holding a convention of delegates from the two counties of North Carolina on the Tennessee waters, and from these three Virginia counties. The delegates were to be chosen by the freemen either in their respective companies of militia, or at the court-houses,² on court day, and to meet at Abington. "In the general Confusion and Disturbance we ought to take care of ourselves," wrote Christian.³ The outcome of the proposition is unknown; but it indicates the delicacy

¹ Staples, *Rhode Island in the Continental Congress*, 479; Barrett, *Evolution of Ordinance of 1787*, 19.

² Christian preferred the use of militia companies, because "so few meet in common at the annual elections." This is a significant fact. See J. F. Jameson, *Virginia Voting in the Colonial Period*, Nation, April 27, 1893.

³ Draper Colls., King's Mountain MSS., IX.; *Cal. Va. State Papers*, III. 414, 572; Gilpin, I. 116; Jefferson to Madison, March 24, 1782, *Writings*, III. 53.

of the western situation, and the readiness of the frontiersmen to rely on their own assemblies. There is evidence that Arthur Campbell continued in correspondence with Congressional leaders. In the summer of 1783, Jefferson reported that Patrick Henry was ready to restrict Virginia to reasonable boundaries, but that instead of ceding the parts lopped off, he was for laying them off into small republics.¹ Henry had his particularistic tendencies tried in the next few years, when as governor he had to support the unity of the Old Dominion against attempts to withdraw her western area.

In June, 1784, North Carolina, following the example of Virginia in the cession of her claims beyond the Ohio, ceded to the United States the region now embraced in Tennessee, providing at the same time that the sovereignty should remain in North Carolina until the cession was accepted by Congress. The Ordinance of 1784 had passed on the 23d of the previous April. According to the boundaries provided therein, the settlements of eastern Tennessee would have fallen within one state, and those on the Cumberland in the one just to the west of that. The settlers on the Tennessee complained that after the cession North Carolina lost all interest in them, and stopped the goods she had promised to the Indians in payment for lands. Thereupon the frontiers were attacked by the savages. In this critical situation, abandoned by North Carolina, without proper provision for courts, or for calling the militia to the field, unprovided for by Congress, it is not surprising that the citizens hastened their independent statehood.² Committees composed of two representatives from each militia company in the counties of North Carolina on the Tennessee met and recommended the election of deputies to meet in convention at Jonesboro'. The Cumberland men were not represented, for the mountains intervened between them and the Tennessee settlements, and their connections were more with Kentucky than with this region. The Jonesboro' convention met on the 23d of August and came to the conclusion that it was for their interest to form a separate state. They believed that the increased immigration which would result from their independence would produce an improvement in agriculture, manufactures, and literature. "The seat of government being among ourselves," said they, "would evidently tend, not only to keep a circulating medium in gold and silver among us, but draw it from many individuals living in other states, who claim large quantities

¹ Jefferson, *Writings*, III. 334.

² Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee*, gives the documentary material on this state of Franklin.

of lands that would lie in the bounds of the new state." By implication this would leave the vacant lands within the state to the state itself, rather than to the United States, and it was one of the points with which Governor Martin of North Carolina reproached them in the manifesto which he issued against their attempt. At the same time, Martin held out hopes that if they returned to the jurisdiction of the parent state, a future amicable separation might be effected, accompanied by a division of the vacant lands between the two states.¹ Another reason advanced for independence was the fact that the more populous eastern settlements would render the western men subservient to them and would legislate against their interests. Finally they urged that Congress by their resolutions had invited them to assume statehood, and that North Carolina's cession had opened the door. It was their hope that the whole valley of the upper Tennessee might be embraced in the new state; for they resolved to admit any contiguous part of Virginia that might make application to join their association, "after they are legally permitted, either by the state of Virginia, *or other power having cognizance thereof.*"² The italicized words indicate how widespread was the belief in Congressional jurisdiction over the West.³ Although North Carolina repealed her cession and provided judicial and military organization for the region under the name of Washington District, the movement had progressed too far to be thus arrested. Sevier was chosen governor, and later conventions took the constitution of North Carolina as the model of their government, and adopted the name of Franklin for the state. The Assembly of Franklin petitioned Congress to ignore the repeal of North Carolina's cession and to accept the infant commonwealth. In the summer of 1785 a Washington county Virginia man wrote that the "new society or State called Franklin has already put off its infant habit and seems to step forward with a florid, healthy constitution; it wants only the paternal guardianship of Congress for a short period, to entitle it to be admitted with *éclat*, as a member of the Federal Government.

¹ Governor Sevier of the new state denied that the question of disposing of the public lands had been settled; but the state afterwards opened land offices. Ramsey, *Tennessee*, 364. Compare Henry, *Patrick Henry*, III. 293.

² The italics are mine.

³ The italicized clause leads Roosevelt (*Winning of the West*, III. 157, 158) to say that "the mountaineers ignored the doctrine of State Sovereignty." These frontiersmen believed in the congressional jurisdiction over the former crown lands; but the italicized words do not warrant the assertion that they ignored the doctrine of state sovereignty. There was much reason for doubting the right of individual states to trans-Alleghany territory.

Here the genuine Republican! here the real Whig will find a safe asylum a comfortable retreat among those modern *Franks*, the hardy mountain men." But the mountain men were not yet to receive the paternal guardianship of Congress. North Carolina made liberal concessions in postponing taxes and promising forgiveness. The settlers divided into the partisans of North Carolina and of Franklin; rival governments held courts, summoned militia, passed laws, and collected taxes over the same area. In the midst of this domestic turmoil, Governor Sevier was forced again and again to lead his riflemen against the Indians whom the land hunger of the Franklin men had aroused.

In the meantime the leaders of Washington county, Virginia, were agitating for union with Franklin. Arthur Campbell lent all of his influence as magistrate and militia officer against continuing with Virginia, and even denounced her taxation on the days when he held court. Rev. Charles Cummings, the backwoods preacher, appealed to his people to stand by their natural rights, and he presided at meetings for separation.¹ Early² in January of 1785 a petition from the leaders was read in Congress praying that they might form part of an independent state, bounded by the Alleghanies on the east, the meridian of the falls of the Ohio on the west; a line from the junction of the Greenbrier and the Great Kanawha to and along the 37th parallel on the north; and the 34th parallel on the south.³ In a word, they desired to erect the upper courses of the Tennessee and the territory about Cumberland Gap into a separate state, a greater Franklin. "We are the first occupants and Aborigines of this Country," said these Indian fighters, "freemen claiming natural rights and privileges of American Citizens." They desired that the disposition of the vacant lands be in the hands of the legislature, with the reservation that the proceeds should be paid to the order of Congress. One may be permitted to doubt whether the terms on which they would sell the lands to themselves would leave much for the Congressional coffers. Again, in the spring of 1785, another petition went to Congress from the deputies of the same county. They proposed modifications in the rigid rectangles that Jefferson had laid down for the western states in the Ordinance of 1784. The eastern meridian line, they complained, passed across a great number of the most inaccessible and craggy

¹ *Cal. Va. State Papers*, IV. 34 *et passim*.

² January 13. See the petition in *Cal. Va. State Papers*, IV. 4. This differs in some verbal respects from the copy in the Department of State.

³ See the map in the previous number.

mountains in America, and severed communities naturally one. The western meridian divided the Kentucky settlers. They proposed two states with natural boundary lines; the Kentucky settlements bounded by the Great Kanawha were to make one, and the upper waters of the Tennessee, including the Muscle Shoals of that river, another.¹ The Cumberland settlers would have been left as the nucleus for another of the states provided for by the Ordinance of 1784. As thus modified, the settlers declared the Ordinance the basis for a liberal and beneficial compact. With this petition they forwarded an association which they had drawn up, resolving, among other things, that the lands "cultivated by individuals belong strictly to them, and not to the government, otherwise every citizen would be a tenant and not a landlord, a vassal and not a freeman; and every government would be a usurpation, not an instrumental device for public good." "For cogent is the reasonings," they exclaimed, "when we can with great truth say: our own blood was spilt in acquiring land for our settlement, our fortunes expended in making these settlements effectual; for ourselves we fought, for ourselves we conquered, and for ourselves alone have we a right to hold."² But Patrick Henry, then governor of Virginia, was ready to resist the loss of this "barrier and nursery of soldiers," and he regarded the Franklin project as "a matter that may ruin the Western Country which must principally support the glory of America in future Times."³ The irate Arthur Campbell reproached this orator of the Revolution with incurring the infamy of a Bernard or a Hutchinson; but his attempts were all in vain.⁴ The state of Franklin dared not receive the Virginians against the will of so powerful a state, and Virginia, following the example of Pennsylvania, passed an act in the fall of 1785, making the erection of an independent government within her limits, except by an act of her Assembly, high treason, and empowering the governor to call out the militia to repress any combination for such purpose.⁵ The state of Franklin, which had steadily lost authority among the settlers, practically expired in 1788. In the fall of the next year Sevier took his seat in the North Carolina Senate, and the year

¹ See the map in previous number.

² They are here using the language of Jefferson's Proposed Instructions to the Virginia Delegates, 1774. Ford's *Jefferson's Writings*, I. 437.

³ Henry, *Patrick Henry*, III. 374.

⁴ The evidence respecting Campbell's plans is in *Cal. Va. State Papers*, IV., *passim*. The petitions and association are in Archives of the Continental Congress, No. 48, pp. 281, 287, 297. Compare Ramsey, *Tennessee*, 320.

⁵ Hening's *Statutes*, XII. 41.

after that he went to Congress from the western district of North Carolina. By the lapse of Franklin, one of her settlements, Sevier County, was left stranded on Indian territory not acquired by North Carolina. They organized themselves by the familiar expedient of a social compact,¹ and continued their association until erected into a county of the Territory of the United States south of the River Ohio, in 1794.

When North Carolina ceded the Tennessee country to Congress in 1790, Patrick Henry, who was interested in the Yazoo land company at the time, declared to a Western correspondent: "I still think great things may be done in the Tennessee Country and below. For surely the People of Franklin will never submit to be given away with the Lands like slaves without holding a Convention of their own as the Kentucky people have done under our Laws. But if we had not assented to it, they would have had a Right to hold one to consult together for their own Good." He calls the act of cession "a most abominable Instance of Tyranny," and says that they ought to do as Vermont has done. "For being cut off from Government without holding any convention of the people there to consent to it all the Rights of Sovereignty over the District and Lands therein belong to the people there." This doctrine, he believed, "neither Congress nor any other persons who understand the principles of the Revolution can controvert or deny."²

While the Indian fighters on the upper waters of the Ohio, and on the tributaries of the Tennessee, had been striving for independent statehood, the Kentucky riflemen, in their turn, had been seeking the same object. The lands for which they had risked their lives in conflict with the savages, were being seized by speculative purchasers from Virginia, who took advantage of the imperfect titles of the pioneers. One of the most important features of the economic history of the West in the eighteenth century, is the way in which preparations for a later aristocracy were being made, by the amassing of vast estates of wilderness through grant or purchase. For the time being these estates did not materially affect social conditions; for they were but wilderness; but they served as nuclei for the movement of assimilation of the frontier to the Southern type when the slave population began its westward march. The pioneer had an intuitive sense of this danger. "We have distressing news from Kentucke," wrote

¹ Ramsey, *Tennessee*, 437, prints these interesting Articles of Association.

² Draper Colls., King's Mountain MSS., XI.

a Westerner,¹ in the summer of 1780, "which is entirely owing to a set of Nabobs in Virginia taking all the lands there by Office Warrants and Pre-emption Rights. Hundreds of Families are ruined by it. In short, it threatens a loss of that Country. Should the English go there and offer them Protection from the Indians, the greatest Part will join. . . . Let the *great Men*, say they, whom the Land belongs to, come and defend it, for we will not lift a Gun in Defense of it." It is easy to understand, therefore, why in the spring of the same year, a petition² came to the Continental Congress, praying that body to organize the counties of Kentucky and Illinois into a separate State. Among their grievances was the granting of the waste lands in great tracts, "without Reservation for Cultivating and Settling the same, whereby Settling the Contry is Discouraged and the inhabitants are greatly exposed to the Saviges by whom our wives and Childring are daly Cruily murdered." They objected to being taxed while enrolled and serving in garrisons. Between them and the appellate courts of justice from six hundred to a thousand miles intervened, and the law miscarried. Although they had taken the oath of allegiance to the United States, Virginia had demanded that they swear allegiance to her, and they knew not to whom they belonged. In the next year³ other attempts at separation were made; and in 1782, as has already been noted, the petition of the Kentucky men aroused a heated debate in Congress.⁴ The Congressional report of 1781, adverse to Virginia's claims,⁵ was circulated in Kentucky by the friends of Congressional control; and one of the agitators was tried and fined as "a divulger of false news." Loyalty to Virginia was diminished by the fact that the inhabitants represented many States, and that correspondence was active between them and persons at the seat of Congress.⁶ One of the interesting side lights on the period is the fact that at this time James Monroe⁷ contemplated removal to Kentucky, and that he solicited confi-

¹ Draper Colls., Clark MSS., XLVI. 59.

² Printed in Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, II. 398.

³ *Cal. Va. State Papers*, III. 385; Putnam, *Middle Tennessee*, 631; Draper Colls., Shane MSS., XI. 39-44; Draper Colls., Trip, 1860, II. 35; Draper Colls., Clark MSS., XXX. 19.

⁴ Thomson Papers, *N. Y. Hist. Colls.*, 1878, p. 145. Compare the undated petition in Archives of Continental Congress, Vol. XLI. 102.

⁵ See page 251, *ante*.

⁶ Walker Daniel (attorney for Virginia) to Fleming, April 14, 1783; Draper Colls., Clark MSS., XLVI. 78, 79; LII. 91; *Va. Cal. State Papers*, III. 555, 584-588.

⁷ Monroe to Clark, October 19, 1783, Draper Colls., Clark MSS., LII. 92.

dential communication with George Rogers Clark, the famous Kentucky leader. Monroe favored a new state, on the ground that it would increase the weight of Virginia politics in the Union.

At last, on December 27, 1784, these sporadic attempts at independence culminated in a convention called by a meeting of leading citizens in the previous November. This convention was composed of a delegate from every captain's company. It declared the grievances¹ already familiar in other Western petitions, of unequal taxes; inefficient administration of justice; lack of provisions for calling out the militia; the drainage of specie to the eastern part of Virginia; and the general neglect due to their remoteness from the seat of government. Among the sources of discontent was the lack of a law for improving the breed of horses,—a matter on which the Transylvania legislators had been prompt to act! The convention made provision for a new convention to meet the following May and to take definite action. The subsequent history of Kentucky's struggle for statehood is a subject for treatment by itself, and too extensive for the limits of this paper. It was complicated by the question of the closing of the Mississippi, and by the fear that Congress would consent thus to see the highway of Western trade barricaded. With it were involved the intrigues of Wilkinson and his friends with Spain, the efforts of England to sound the separatist tendencies of the West, and the dilatory caution of Virginia, as well as the fact that in this period the change was effected from the government under the Articles of Confederation to that under the federal Constitution. That in the many blunders and misunderstandings which grew out of this situation, Kentucky adhered to legal methods, indicates much self-restraint on the part of the settlers. But had matters not taken a favorable turn at the time most critical, Kentucky was in a fair way to have crowned this movement for independence by placing itself in the position of a state out of the Union.² While Wilkinson was playing his game for a Spanish alliance, or at least for Spanish bribes, even such honest Westerners as Sevier and Robertson entered into correspondence with Spanish agents in the critical period of 1788; and George Rogers Clark offered to expatriate himself and accept the flag of Spain in return for a liberal land grant for a trans-Mississippi colony. Col. George Morgan, hopeless of securing

¹ Draper Colls., Newspaper Extracts, 1785, p. 1. *Pennsylvania Packet*, May 9, 1785; cf. *Kentucky Gazette*, October 18, 1788.

² The best general account of these movements is in Roosevelt, III.; but the documentary material in Gayarré, *Louisiana*, Green's *Spanish Conspiracy*, and *Report of Canadian Archives*, 1890, as well as in the Draper Collections, is important.

from Congress his desire for Indiana Company lands, sought the Spanish power, and was promised an immense domain opposite the mouth of the Ohio, for a colony to be called New Madrid. In this period also was formed the Yazoo company, whose agent, Dr. O'Fallon (Clark's brother-in-law), proposed to the Spaniards that his colony should become subjects of Spain, if unmolested by that power.¹ The apprehensions of Patrick Henry and Grayson regarding the relinquishment of the Mississippi by Congress under the proposed federal constitution, all but turned Virginia against that instrument in the ratification convention.² The Kentucky radicals desired to establish a state regardless of Virginia's consent, and without securing the permission of the federal government, and thus to be in a position to ratify or reject the new federal constitution; to make terms with Spain; or to stand alone and await events. "Our Political era is at hand!" exultantly wrote Judge Wallace,³ of the Kentucky convention, to Arthur Campbell in 1788.

All along the border the party favorable to new states had been balked. The hopes awakened by the Ordinance of 1784, of Congressional organization of the whole West, had so far borne no fruit in the settled regions, although the unoccupied Northwest had been splendidly provided for in 1787. Checked or rebuffed by the parent states, neglected by Congress, their very industrial life threatened by the closure of the Mississippi, it was not surprising that they gave to the separatist movement a more aggressive form. The Kentuckians had reason to think that the whole frontier sympathized with them. The Western counties of Pennsylvania were excited;⁴ the French on the Illinois had grown impatient of the lack of government and the insecurity of their land titles; the surviving Franklin partisans were ready to join in a Western uprising; the people of Cumberland sent their agents to ask to be incorporated in the state of Kentucky;⁵ and Arthur Campbell was in correspondence with leading advocates of Kentucky separation, and was proposing a general coalescence of the Western country.⁶ Added to all of these evidences of unrest was the attitude of Eng-

¹ Compare Isaac Sherman's proposed Connecticut colony beyond the Mississippi. *Can. Archives*, 1890. See Haskins' *Yazoo Company*, in *American Historical Association*, V. 395.

² Elliot's *Debates*, III.; Stone, *Ordinance of 1787*.

³ Draper Colls., King's Mountain MSS., IX.

⁴ Draper Colls., Clark MSS., XI. 153, citing *Maryland Journal*, July 3, 1787.

⁵ McDowell to A. Campbell, September 23, 1787, Draper Colls., King's Mountain MSS., IX.; Speed, *Danville Political Club*, 136; Putnam, 280.

⁶ C. Wallace to A. Campbell, Sept. 19, 1788, Draper Colls., King's Mountain MSS., IX.

land and Spain, both of which powers were sounding the West regarding its readiness to cast off the connection with the Union.¹ Such facts show how impossible it would have been to have governed the West by any system of provincial administration.

If these forces of disunion had prevailed, the indications point rather to a Mississippi Valley federation, a union of the Western Waters, than to a lapse into independent communities indifferent to each other's fate. The readiness of the settlers to appeal to each other for aid, the negotiations for mutual political connection at various times in this period, the physiographic unity of the Mississippi Valley, and the dangerous neighborhood of England and Spain, all lead to the same conclusion.²

The results of this study may be summarized in conclusion. We have found that the writers on the organization of the West have made the Ordinance of 1787, and the vacant country beyond the Ohio, the object of their inquiry and that they have thus been led to slight the occupied area involved,—that is, the lands between the Alleghanies and the Ohio. It follows that the part played by the frontiersmen themselves has been neglected. The documents surviving in their rude chirography and frontier spelling, the archives of Congress and the newspapers of the time, have enabled us to show that so far from being passive spectators of the Congressional plans for their political future, the frontiersmen were agitated by every new proposal of that body. They tried to shape their own civil destiny.

We have noted, too, the importance of the physiographic explanation of the movement. The new state activity extended all along the frontier; but in three areas, natural economic unities, separate states were proposed. The eastern tributaries of the upper Ohio made the area of Vandalia, Westsylvania, part of Paine's projected state, and the many unnamed states projected in the period from 1780 to 1784. The persistence of the physiographic influence in this unit is seen in the Whiskey Rebellion in western Pennsylvania, and in the continuous struggle of West Virginia against control by the eastern section of that state, until at last her object was gained in the Civil War, and an independent state on the lines of Vandalia, though not of Westsylvania, was formed. The second economic unit, around the upper course of the Tennessee, was the area of the Watauga Association, the

¹ Interesting material on the situation in the West in 1789 is in *Report of Canadian Archives*, 1890. See Gayarré, *Louisiana, Spanish Dom.*, 206, 228; Green, *Spanish Conspiracy*; Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, III.

² Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, III. 127, 128, 94, 95, holds the contrary view.

state of Franklin, and the proposed greater Franklin of Arthur Campbell. Virginia retained her portion of this tract, and assimilated the descendants of these leaders to the great planter type; but the Tennessee region was organized as the Territory of the United States south of the river Ohio, in 1790, and six years later it became a state. The union of the Cumberland pasture-lands with the mountain tracts of East Tennessee was physiographically unnatural. In the debates at Nashville, preceding the Civil War, the proposition for organizing a union state of Franklin out of the mountain lands received much attention,¹ and it was this area that furnished most of the Tennessee soldiers for the Union army in that war, and which to-day holds to the Republican party, while the rest of the state has usually given its votes to the Democratic party. In the Kentucky unit, too, after a decade of struggle, independent statehood was acquired. All of these movements were natural expressions of physiographic influences. They were all led by sons of Virginia, and the same era that saw the downfall of her tobacco-planting aristocracy seemed likely to witness the restriction of Virginia's vast domain to limits narrower than those imposed in the Civil War. But she was able to resist the full effects of these influences.

Another result revealed by this general view, is the variety of the new governmental plans, and the fact that there appeared in this area of vacant lands, as in the colonial area long before, plans of proprietary companies, and social compacts, or associations. The Ordinances of Congress, moreover, provided for a type of government comparable to that of the royal colonies; the idea of close control by the general government was common to both; but the type was revolutionized by the American conditions. The weakness of the proprietary plans, also, shows the influence of the wilderness training in liberty. The theory of the associations was a natural outcome of the combined influences of Puritan political philosophy, in its Scotch-Irish form, the revolutionary spirit, and the forest freedom. All through these compacts runs the doctrine that the people in an unoccupied land have the right to determine their own political institutions. In announcing the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty," therefore, Cass and Douglas merely gave utterance to a time-honored Western idea.²

This idea was, nevertheless, merely an extension of the prin-

¹ Phelan, *Tennessee*, 104.

² A committee of the Wisconsin legislature declared in 1843 that it was a doctrine well understood in this country, that all "political communities have the right of governing themselves in their own way within their lawful boundaries."

ciples and methods of the Revolution to the West. In interpreting the history of colonial settlement so as to meet the needs of the revolutionary arguments, John Adams had held that the original colonists carried with them only natural rights, and having settled a new country according to the law of nature, were not bound to submit to English law unless they chose it. Jefferson had compared the original colonial migrations to the migrations of their Saxon ancestors to England; and he had asserted that the colonists "possessed a right which nature has given to all men, of . . . going in quest of new habitations and of there establishing new societies under such laws and regulations as to them shall seem most likely to promote public happiness. . . . Settlements having been thus effected in the wilds of America, the emigrants thought proper to adopt that system of laws under which they had hitherto lived in the mother country." Such were the theories urged by the revolutionary leaders respecting the political rights of settlers in vacant regions, at the very time when the frontiersmen were occupying the lands beyond the mountains. These doctrines formed convenient bases for the formation of associations, for the assertion of the ownership of their lands by the settlers in defiance of the parent state; for their complaints against the actions of these states and for their demands for independence. The revolutionary states found themselves obliged to repudiate some of their own doctrines in dealing with their western communities. In the Franklin convention the Declaration of Independence was read to show that reasons for separation from England urged in that document applied equally well to the relation of the western counties to the counties of the coast.

It is a noteworthy fact, however, that so many of these associations accepted the laws and constitution of an older state. The frontier did not proceed on the principle of *tabula rasa*; it modified older forms, and infused into them the spirit of democracy.¹

Examining the grievances of the Westerners, one is impressed with the similarity of the reasons for wishing independent statehood, in all the petitions from all the regions. They were chiefly the following: disputed boundaries, uncertain land titles, inefficient organization of justice and military defence, due to the remoteness of the capital; the difficulty of paying taxes in specie; the dislike of paying taxes at all when the pioneers were serving in Indian warfare, and were paying money into the state treasury for their lands; general incompatibility of interests between the frontiers-

¹ Compare the Exeter covenant where the "liberties of our English Colony of the Massachusetts" were asserted.

men and the planters, and the aggravation of this fact by the control which the East retained in the legislatures.¹ Perhaps no factor in the explanation of the new state activity is of more importance than the Westerners' desire to organize states that should own the vacant lands within their bounds. This would enable them to determine the price of the public lands, and this would enable them to reduce taxes while assuming government. But it was just this that Congress could not be expected to permit. The policy of Calhoun to win Western support at a later period by yielding to the states the public lands within their limits, was based on a thorough understanding of Western traits.

Through all these petitions and memorials runs the sentiment that Congress might, or ought to, assume jurisdiction over the West. The frontiersmen exerted a constant pressure on Congress to exalt its powers. The Crown had asserted its control over the lands beyond the sources of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic by the Proclamation of 1763, when it forbade settlement and the patenting of land therein. On the eve of the Revolution it had all but completed a grant to the Vandalia Company, providing for a colonial government in the limits of Virginia's trans-Alleghany claim. This company tried to persuade Congress to assert the possession and jurisdiction of the lands beyond the mountains, as the property of the whole Union by devolution from the Crown when independence was declared. To the westerners the theory of Congressional control was attractive. It seemed to exact nothing and to promise much. They looked for organization into independent states of the Union; they looked for deliverance from the rule of the coast counties in the legislatures, the rule of a section radically unlike the West; they looked for lighter taxation and for all the advantages of self-government; they hoped to own the lands within their borders. It is not strange that with these ideals they appealed to the central government for organization into states. But in any case there were strong national tendencies in the West. These communities were made up of settlers from many states, and this mixture of peoples diminished the loyalty to the claimant states, and increased the tendency to appeal to national authority. It was chiefly, however, because the national power could promote the interests of the West that that section was so ready to turn to it. It was ready to abandon this attitude when its interest was threatened, as the Mississippi question clearly shows. But for the

¹ Compare Jefferson, *Notes on Virginia*, 127 (1853); *Debates in Virginia Constitutional Convention, 1829-1830*; Brevard, *Digest of S. C. Laws* (1814) pp. xiv, ff.; *N. C. Colonial Records*, VII., pp. xix, ff.

most part it has been for the interest of the national government to legislate in the interest of the West, and so the West has been not only in the era of the Revolution, but ever since, a great nationalizing force in our history.

In fine, we see in these agitations along the Alleghanies the early political efforts of the rude, boisterous West, checked as yet by the tide-water area, but already giving promise of the day when, in the person of Andrew Jackson, its forces of democracy and nationalism should rule the republic.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER.

OFFICE-SEEKING DURING WASHINGTON'S ADMINISTRATION

WHEN Washington became President under the Constitution, he was without any precedent which he could use with advantage in selecting men for public office. In England and France, the two countries with whose governments he was most familiar, offices were obtained by court favor or by family influence. Their practices were examples to be shunned rather than followed. In this country there had been no system, but there had been a general desire to have meritorious government officials, if meritorious men could be induced to serve. In the states all but the highest officers were named by the governors or elected by the legislatures, and the federal officials were chosen by Congress. But with the adoption of the Constitution there was a great change. Many state offices became federal offices, and the early congresses created a large number of new places, which the change of government rendered necessary. The fountain head of all appointing power was the President. The advice and consent of the Senate were to be invoked only after he had made the nomination. He was to create no offices, but he was to fill all the offices. Washington, as the executive head of a new government, was confronted with a task of extraordinary magnitude, and not the least of its difficulties was involved in the question of appointments to office. Before his inauguration, even before the requisite number of states had ratified the Constitution, letters from army officers and civilians, asking for appointments under the new government, began pouring in upon him. It was no more possible for him than it has been possible for his successors to make all of the appointments from his personal knowledge of suitable men. He sought out a few for the higher positions, and in a more limited proportion for the lesser offices, but the bulk of the offices he filled by selections from among those who applied for them. It may be presumed that some of the applications were never reduced to writing, and that some never became a part of the President's official papers, but so many are preserved among the government archives that it is safe to say they include a considerable majority of all the applications made. They were sent to the Department

of State, which at that time, more than any other executive department, was regarded as the President's office. There are none covering this period among the archives of the other departments. Many of the papers are indorsed in Washington's own hand, and it is probable that few of them were not examined by him. A few requests for domestic offices were addressed in the first instance to the Secretaries of State, of the Treasury, and of War, and nearly all applications for foreign appointments were sent directly to the Secretary of State. A few others were sent to senators and representatives, by whom they were referred to the President, but most of the applications were sent to the President in the first place. In the beginning some were addressed to the President and the Senate jointly, the applicants doubtless supposing that, under the Constitution, the Senate shared the appointing power with the President. These were all referred to the Senate by Washington.¹

Within certain limitations the applications show what were the reasons upon which he based his selections for office, but they do not in all cases show all the reasons. Verbal inquiries made by the President or at his instance, verbal representations made to him, and the extent of his own knowledge of the applicants were often determining factors in the appointments and seldom appear of record. An instance of this is the case of Benjamin Fishbourn, nominated to be naval officer of the port of Savannah. The Senate having rejected him, probably on grounds involving political or personal opposition, Washington nominated Lachlan McIntosh, observing in his message of August 7, 1789, that he presumed the reasons for the Senate's action were sufficient, but adding: "Permit me to submit to your consideration whether, on occasions where the propriety of nominations appear questionable to you, it would not be expedient to communicate that circumstance to me, and thereby avail yourselves of the information which led me to make them, and which I would with pleasure lay before you." He gives his reasons for having nominated Fishbourn, who served under his eye in the war and whose conduct was "irreproachable." He behaved gallantly at the storming of Stony Point. Since his residence in Georgia he had been a member of the Assembly, of the Executive Council, a lieutenant-colonel of militia, and was appointed by the Council to an office similar to the one for which the President nominated him. The President says that he received private letters recommending him, but they were secondary considerations. He concludes: "It ap-

¹ *Executive Journal of the Senate*, I. 9.

peared, therefore, to me that Mr. Fishbourn must have enjoyed the *confidence* of the militia officers, in order to have been elected to a military rank; the *confidence* of the freemen, to have been elected to the Assembly; the *confidence* of the Assembly, to have been selected for the Council; and the *confidence* of the Council, to have been appointed collector of the port of Savannah."¹

Turning to the papers in the case, it appears that Fishbourn wrote to Washington as early as May 12, informing him of the appointment he had received from the state government, and on May 17 he wrote again stating his expectation of receiving a presidential appointment, and lamenting, at the same time, that General Wayne had not been chosen to represent Georgia in the Senate.

Here it will be noticed that the operating causes of Fishbourn's nomination — Washington's personal knowledge of the applicant and his services and private recommendations received in his behalf — do not form a part of the official record.

Nevertheless, some of the papers are so full as to be convincing proof of the reasons for the appointments, and others furnish a fair basis from which the reasons may be inferred.² We will take up the papers of several of the successful applicants.

Jabez G. Fitch was appointed, June 9, 1794, marshal of the Vermont district upon the recommendation of Samuel Hitchcock and Israel Smith. Hitchcock writes that the marshal "should reside near Champlain, as the principal business of the district court originates there." Fitch lives at Vergennes, and has served for some time as deputy marshal. He would discharge the duties of marshal with fidelity and dignity. Smith writes that Fitch is about thirty years of age, "has had a polite education," is of good

¹ *Executive Journal of the Senate*, I. 16.

² During the eight years of his administration Washington appointed of revenue officers, including collectors, surveyors, commanders of revenue cutters, inspectors, naval officers and supervisors, one hundred and twenty-five; of commissioners of loans, eighteen; fifteen diplomatic officers; sixty-one consular officers; eight territorial judges; twenty-nine judges of the district courts; three comptrollers of the Treasury; thirty-six United States attorneys; forty-one United States marshals; four members of the legislative councils of the territories; three purveyors of public supplies; seven commissioners to treat with the Indian tribes; nine surveyors of the federal district; four commissioners to settle the accounts between the states and the United States; ten officers of the mint at Philadelphia; a superintendent of the opening of the national road; a paymaster of the troops; a register of the Treasury; five commissioners to open subscriptions to the United States Bank; a commissioner of internal revenue; a surveyor-general; a governor of the Northwest Territory; two auditors of the Treasury; and six miscellaneous officers, making in all three hundred and fifty-one civil officers, not including judges of the Supreme Court, heads of departments, and a number of small offices. *Department of State, MS. Archives.*

moral character, and the fact that he is now deputy marshal is particularly in his favor. He repeats Hitchcock's statements about the desirability of his residence, and adds that the district judge and supervisors have asked him to write in Fitch's behalf.

Matthew Clarkson was appointed marshal of New York August 5, 1791. He writes from Philadelphia, January 2, 1790, recalling the fact that he acted under Washington's immediate command, "as a principal in the department of auditor of accounts to the army," and was personally known to Washington. He desires to be made a commissioner "for the locating and establishing" of a permanent residence for Congress. He concludes: "Convinced that the nomination or appointment to offices which you are pleased to make, have suitable qualifications, personal merit, and former services for their objects, uninfluenced by the solicitations of friends,—I cheerfully rest my application upon that issue as the most honorable." Later he recalls his application to the President's attention, soliciting the office of auditor of accounts in the Treasury Department.

John Stokes was appointed judge of the district court of North Carolina August 3, 1790. Just before his appointment (July 31, 1790), John Steele, a representative from North Carolina, writes: "I am authorized to say that Colonel Stokes will serve as judge for the district of North Carolina, if appointed. In a conversation on the subject with himself he expressed a wish that Colonel Davie¹ might hold that office in preference to any other man; but on condition that he declined offering or refused to accept, he was not unwilling to be mentioned as a candidate." He adds that Stokes has served as a state judge and would give general satisfaction.

North Carolina had at first rejected the Constitution, and there is evidence that Washington exercised great care in the selection of officers who were to serve in that state. The following memorandum is in Jefferson's handwriting:—

INDORSED "FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, JUNE 7th, 1790."

North Carolina

District judge. Col^o Davie is recommended by Steele.

Hawkins sais he is their first law character.

Brown sais the same.

Samuel Spencer.

Steele sais he is a good man, one of the present judges, not remarkable for his abilities, but deserves well of his country.

¹ William R. Davie was appointed to the same position June 8, 1791.

Bloodworth sais Spencer desires the appointment, but sais nothing of him.

John Stokes.

Steele names him at his own request. he is a Virginian, was a Captⁿ in the late war, lost his right hand in Beaufort's defeat. practises law in S. Carolina with reputation and success ; has been frequently of the legislature, was a member of the convention, a federalist,¹ is now a Col^l of Militia cavalry and additional judge of the Supreme Court.

Hawkins has understood he is a worthy man.

Ashe names him.

District Attorney.

Hamilton. named by Bloodworth.

Hawkins sais he is now under indictment and will be silenced.

Hay. named by Bloodworth.

Hawkins sais he is an Irishman who came over about the close of the war to see after some confiscated property he has married in the country.

Arnet. named by Bloodworth.

Hawkins sais he is a N. Jerseyman of good character.

Sitgreaves.

Hawkins sais he lives in Newbern where the courts are held. he is a gentlemanly man, and as good a lawyer as any there.

Ashe sais that Sitgreaves is not so brilliant in abilities, but of great rectitude of mind.

Bloodworth sais that Sitgreaves is a gentleman of character & represented the state in Congress in 1785.²

* * * * *

The appointments in Rhode Island were made largely upon a political basis. Several of the papers will be quoted further on in this paper.

Where exceptional circumstances seemed to require it, Washington considered the politics of those whom he appointed to office. "I shall not," he wrote to Timothy Pickering, September 27, 1795, "whilst I have the honor to administer the government, bring a man into any office of consequence knowingly whose political tenets are adverse to the measures which the general government are pursuing; for this, in my opinion, would be a sort of

¹ In explanation of Jefferson's statement that Stokes was a Federalist, it can only be said that at that time Jefferson's anti-federal sentiments were not fully declared, and furthermore that he was setting forth claims to appointment which would influence his chief.

² On the same date as the memorandum, Washington sent the following North Carolina nominations to the Senate: William R. Davie, to be judge; John Sitgreaves, to be attorney; John Skinner, to be marshal. *Executive Journal of the Senate*, I. 50.

political suicide."¹ This statement was used with reference to the appointment of an attorney-general, and can be stretched to cover only the higher offices. But in the Rhode Island appointments it would certainly have been suicidal if the enemies of the federal government had received recognition. The state had given in its adhesion to the Union at a late date and by a slender majority, and the "antis" could not safely be given any opportunity of undoing the work which the Federalists had accomplished with so much difficulty. The case was entirely exceptional. The true basis of Washington's appointments was correctly stated in Matthew Clarkson's application, as "suitable qualifications, personal merit, and former services."

Taking up the applications without especial reference to their successful issue, it may be said that they show what were regarded by the people at large as valid claims to office. They come from no particular class, and range from letters written by men of scholarship and education to those emanating from the most illiterate. They are distributed with impartiality over the whole of the thirteen states. They group themselves into five distinct heads.

I. Those based wholly upon the fitness of the candidate to perform the duties of the office. This group is so much larger than any other that it may be said to comprise fully three-fourths of the whole. The following example is from General Benjamin Lincoln, advocating the appointment of John Lowell as a judge of the Supreme Court. It was unsuccessful so far as that office was concerned, but Lowell was soon afterwards appointed a United States district judge.

BOSTON, July 18th, 1789.

I consider, my dear General, that not only the happiness of the people under the new government but that the very existence of it depends, in a great measure upon the capacity and ability of those who may be employed in the judiciary and executive branches of government. Under this government I hope yet to live and to leave in its arms a large and extensive family. I cannot therefore be an inattentive spectator while the important business of organization is before your Excellency nor be silent when there is but a possibility of my doing the least good. As your Excellency cannot be personally acquainted with all who ought to come forward and aid in the administration but must rely, in some degree, on the information of gentlemen in the different States for the character of those who may be commissioned to fill the several departments which may be erected in perfecting the general system I therefore beg leave to mention to you

¹ *Washington's Writings*, ed. Ford, XII. 107.

Excellency that the common voice of the people here points out M^r Lowell as a gentleman well qualified to fill one of the seats upon the bench of the supream court. — The purity of his mind, the strength and promptitude of his judgment, and his knowledge of the law united with his having held a similar office under the old confederation have directed their views to this gentleman —

I am very apprehensive that he has not by any way communicated his wishes to your Excellency. If he has not the omission may originate in the extreem delicacy of the measure. It is an office which to fill with honour and dignity requires an honest heart, a clear head, and a perfect knowledge of law in its extensive relations the truth of which he so fully realises that he is restrained from making a tender of his services as it would evince his belief that he enjoys the great and necessary quallifications to fill the office — To this a gentleman of M^r Lowell's nice feelings would be brought with great reluctance

I hope the above hints will be acceptable — If they do good my intentions will be perfectly answered — If they do not my apology for making them is the rectitude of my intentions —

I have the honour of being
with the highest esteem

My dear General your Excellency's
most obedient and humble

servant B. LINCOLN.

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES.

II. Those in which the applicant's military service plays the most important part. This group is a large one; but, while a military record is adduced incidentally in many of the applications, it is put forward as the sole claim for office in very few cases. The following letter from Richard Peters, of Pennsylvania, was written in behalf of General Anthony Wayne: —

BELMONT, August 2, 1790.

Sir

Averse as I am from a Desire to trouble you on such Subjects my Anxiety on Account of the Situation in which a worthy Character is unfortunately placed has induced me to take the Liberty of mentioning to you the unhappy Predicament in which General Wayne stands — As Matters have turned out he was cursed with a Present from the State of Georgia of a Rice Plantation which they gave him with very laudable Intentions. Before he began to improve this Property he was possessed of a handsome Fortune which from a too eager Desire to encrease it he has totally destroyed. Yet he has been a most industrious Slave to the Pursuit and cannot be accused of anything unworthy his Character. He relied upon the opinions of enthusiastic People on his first undertaking the Business and before he had gained Sufficient Experience he was

irreparably ruined. I believe however he will have enough to satisfy the Demands ag'nst him but I am confident he will have Nothing left either of his patrimonial Estate or the pecuniary Rewards for his military Services. In short he will be in Want.

I have seen a Plan of a federal Land office. The Place of all others I think him most capable of executing is that of Surveyor General. I know he is an excellent Draftsman and has a Genius for this Business in which he has been practically employed. Should you Sir think proper to give him that Appointment I am convinced he will do Justice to your Choice. But if in your better Judgment you have any other in View I shall be happy in the Endeavor to serve a worthy Man whose Situation I most sincerely lament. I have not been solicited by him to give you this Trouble and hope the Goodness of my Intentions will induce you to Excuse the Liberty I have taken.

I have the Honour to be
with the most respectful Esteem
Your most obed Serv^t

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

RICHARD PETERS.

III. Those in which the applicant requests continuance in an office which he held under the former government. This group is a large one, and the applications were often successful.¹

CHARLESTON, S^c CAROLINA, 31st March, 1789—

Although it may appear a degree of presumption in me to address your Excellency, yet were I to neglect it, it might be deemed a fault, the occasion I trust will plead my excuse—The enclosed Letters will explain the motive, which I hope backed by the opinion of The Senators from this State, will have some weight in continuing me in the Office of Collector for this Port under the new Government, which Office I have held for the State since the Revolution—should any other Candidates of superior abilities offer for the Office, I must rest satisfied, and rejoice that such are to be found, but should your Excellency and the Senate think me sufficiently qualified my unremitting attention shall be used in the faithful discharge of it.

With the greatest respect and wishes for your Excellencys health, I take the Liberty to subscribe myself—

Your Excellencys
Most Obedient and
Most humble servant

GEO: ABBOTT HALL.

¹ "Conversing on the subject of these appointments [revenue] lately with the P., I mentioned two principles which I had the pleasure to hear him approve of. The first that state officers in similar lines who had behaved well deserved preference in the service of the United States; and 2^{dly}, that having discharged these duties undivided, now that they become divided, the same officers were entitled to the best." —RICHARD HENRY LEE to —, June 7, 1789, Washington's *Writings*, ed. Ford, XI. 394.

IV. Those which appeal to benevolent considerations. The large number of applications which fall under this head are evidence of the prevailing belief in Washington's charitable disposition, and the papers in one case, that of John F. Sonnet, of Philadelphia, show that the President answered the appeal, not by an appointment to office, but by an "affectionate letter," accompanied by "seasonable relief." The following letter is from a lady, who begs for a clerkship for her son:—

Sir:

Permit me among the multitude who rejoice at your appointment, to congratulate you, as president of the United States of America, and to assure your Excellency that I enjoy an heart felt satisfaction at any event tending to promote your happiness or exaltation. May I hope you have some recollection of one who had the honor of being known to you some years back at Paramus New Jersey? I have indeed no claim to your particular attention—but presume on your distinguished humanity, and benevolence to distress. The late American war has in its consequence proved ruinous to my family, darkened my prospects of providing for my fatherless Children, and marked me the Child of misfortune! My second son Charles aged twenty one years, a youth of spirit, sobriety and honesty, writes a legible hand, and good accountant, qualified for a Clerk in an office—or in the military line being acquainted with Tacticks, I am destitute of the requisite to push him forward in life and humbly request that in the arraignment of appointments your Excellency would cast a thought on him, which would relieve my anxious breast, and confer a lasting obligation on a Lad of good morals and Character who looks up to you. I should be at a loss how to apologize for my addressing you on this occasion—were I not convinced of your great sensibility and inclination to do good. for this purpose may your valuable life be long preserved, and the choicest gifts of heaven be your reward.

Prays your Excellencys petitioner and
Most Obedient respectful
Humble servant

LYDIA WATKINS.

NEW YORK May 5th 1789. Broad Way N^o 10
HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

V. Those in which political considerations are an important feature. Jefferson, as we have seen, described John Stokes, of North Carolina, as a Federalist. In the application of Joseph Woodward, of Massachusetts, two of his endorsers state that he is a friend of the Constitution and a Federalist, and there are a few more instances where similar statements appear. Beyond this the subject plays no part, so far as the applications show, except in

the case of the applications from Rhode Island, and here it plays a very important part. The contest for the offices began before the state had accepted the Constitution. The following letter was written five days before that event by John Collins, governor from 1786 to 1789, and afterwards a member of Congress:—

NEWPORT, May 24th 1790.

Sir:

In all the vicissitudes of time, and changes of sentiments that have taken place in the United States, I have uniformly believed that the most essential happiness of our country, ultimately depended, upon the establishment of an efficient executive power, under one federal head; being the only means, to obtain that tone to government necessary, to answer the ends of its situation; the securing the general peace, promoting the general interests, — establishing the National character and rendering the Union indissolubly permanent — A power to control the selfish interests of a Single State, and to compel the sacrifice of partial views to promote the common weal.

A government thus calculated to cultivate the principles of universal Justice, probity and honour, must be the source of national strength, as well as happiness to mankind — However I have been uniformly Actuated by these principles, the ill directed zeal of the majority of the people of this state counteracting these principles, and my consciousness of possessing the general confidence, hath hitherto led me to a degree of caution in my conduct and open declaration on the score of political concerns; expecting to effect more from my moderation and influence in public character, than by a conduct more explicit and pointed; which is fully evinced by what has taken place in consequence of my act in the appointment of a convention to adopt the constitution; which depended solely on me; and such was the caprice of the people, that all public confidence was withdrawn from me, and was deprived of every public trust and emolument. — This was a voluntary sacrifice, the event being well known, and comparatively a small one when Just anticipations pourtray to me the great, the general advantages arising from a Completion of the union of the States (for have no doubt of the adoption) but altho personal sacrifices for the general good have been long familiar to me, (and if you have any knowledge of my property or character you must be conscious they have been many and weighty) they are more easily supported by the hope of compensation — and when I reflect upon your friendship, generosity and goodness, with how much it will be in your power to gratifie me, you will give me leave to anticipate your influence and appointment to the office of collector for the district of Newport — your Excellency's attention to me in this shall be ever had in lasting remembrance.

Your goodness will forgive the trouble given you, by an application

from him, who will obey your commands with chearfulness and alacrity
— and honour you without flattery Am —

With every Sentiment of respect
and Esteem

Your Humble Servt.

JOHN COLLINS.

The temper of the people of the state is well illustrated by the following:—

PROVIDENCE, June 11th, 1790.

D^r S^r:

We are happy in the Late Event of this States becoming one of the Union, tho at this late Hour, Had the people been so Fortunate as to have known their True Interest no one State would have adopted the New Constitution Sooner than this.

Grait Exertions have been made and Very Large Sacrifises of Property by the Fedderals of this Place to change the Pollicy of this Government which for this Four Years Last past have been constantly opposing the adoption of the new constitution and of course have done very Grait Injustice with their paper money, and we sincerely Hope that none of those carrectors may be promoted to Aney office by Congress, Maney things we Doubt not has beene and will be said by Letter or otherwise frome the Principle carrectors among the Anties, theirby if Possible to Induce a beleave in the President, that some of their Friends are Intituled to Promotion, but we Hope such Deception will not have its Desired Influence, as we now assure you that every member of the convention who was in the Least under the Influence of the Anties of this Town, Voted and used all their Influence against the adoption, and a negative Vote would have passed had it not beene for the *Very Grait* Exurtions of the Fedderals in Gaining the Votes of Portsmouth and Middletown which was Quite Remote from the Influence of the Anties of this Town, We now having so brite a Prospect before us, of Justice and Equity being Substituted by, in Lue of Fraud and Injustice being promoted Under the culler of Law, we Begg Leave to take the Libberty of Recommending a core of Honest Faithfull and Vigilent Custom House Officers for this Department Such as will cause Every Copper of the Renew that shall become due by the Laws of Congress to be punctually paid to the Treasury of the United States, . . . ¹

We are D^r S^r with the Graitest
Respect and Esteeme Your
Most Ob^t Most Humble Serv^t

JOHN BROWN.

JOHN FRANCIS.

¹ The omissions here and in other letters cited are not for purposes of concealment, but merely to economize space.

How carefully the administration investigated the character and antecedents of the Rhode Island candidates is shown in a letter from Henry Marchant written to Alexander Hamilton, but indorsed in Washington's hand.

NEWPORT, Dec^r 9th 1793.

Private and Confidential.

Dear Sir,

By the last Post I was honored with your confidential Communication of the 20th of Nov! — From appearances here I was fearful some embarrassment might arise on the Subject of a fit Person for District Attorney for this District. — Wishing to be as happy as possible with the Person who should be appointed; — and not knowing that my Sentiments might be expected, or to whom I might with Propriety address them, and knowing they were at all Times demandable; — upon so delicate a Subject I did not interfere my Opinion, but contented myself with informing the President thro' the Secretary of State, with the Vacancy of that Office, by the Death of Mr. Channing — . . .

With Respect to the two Gentlemen recommended, Mr. Howell and Mr. Barnes, I have not the least personal Predeliction. I conceive it my Duty to comply with your request. The Interest of the Public shall be my End, in the Freedom with which I shall venture to express my Ideas. — Upon almost any other Occasion I should not conceive myself at this Liberty. Mr. Howell I have been many years acquainted with, and ever on good Terms. — You might have had some Knowledge of Him in Congress, and consequently in some good Measure of His political Character, Temper of Mind and Abilities. — He was not then a Lawyer. — He is a Man of Learning — He was for some years very useful in a learned Society, — the College of this State. He has been a Member of the Legislature, and a Judge of the Superior Court of this State: — and then it was I believe, that He first had the Thought of studying Law with an Intention of entering into the Profession. — Upon quitting the Bench, He soon after was admitted an Att^r and Counsellor at Law, and has been, for one year only I think, Att^r Gen^l. of the state. There is no Doubt of his Learning and Abilities sufficient for the exercise of the Office of an Att^r of the U. S. —, nor has His Integrity, to my Knowledge, ever been questioned. — It has been frequently lamented that His political Conduct has been unsteady, and supposed to be too much lead by Motives of present applaudits; — and He has accordingly never been so happy as to retain them long in any Place or station. He does not appear to me possessed of those easy and accommodating Manners, which consistant with Integrity and Justice to our own Opinions, are essential to gain and preserve Esteem and Confidence. Sanguine and persevering at the Moment, — He yet wants Steadiness and Prudence. —

It is indeed to be regretted that this affair should assume a Party Completion. To this part of the State, I am confident Mr. Howell would

not be agreable — Nor are they sanguine in Behalf of Mr. Barnes. — They have not I believe thought it proper to interfere. I am convinced however, they would be more happy if on enquiry, a third Character could be found competent and eligible. — Upon the Decease of Mr. Channing Our Thoughts turned upon Mr. Benj^m Bourne and Mr. Ray Greene, as there was a handsome opening for two Gentlemen of the Profession. It was with Pleasure we heard, both those Gentlemen had thoughts of coming here. But Mr. Bourne may not think such an Appointment an Object sufficient to induce Him to quit Congress, or that His Duty to His Constituents would justify Him in suddenly quitting His Post. — Whether He should reside in Newport or Providence, all Parties I doubt not would be satisfied with the Appointment. — I must say again, that wherever the Judge resides it would be happy to Him and beneficial to the Public that the Atty. should reside in the same Place —

Mr. Ray Greene is the Son of William Greene Esq^r. of Warwick about the Center of this State. The old Gentleman very independant in His Circumstances is a thorough Whig, highly esteemed, was Governor of this State in our most arduous and trying scenes with the highest approbation. — His Father, — Grandfather to the present Gentleman had been Gov^r. many years past, and in like manner possessed the public Confidence. — A Relation and the closest Friendship subsisted between this Family and the late Gen^l Greene. — The present Mr. Ray Greene possesses in an eminent Degree the virtues of His Father and Grandfather with the advantage of a liberal Education. . . .

With Respect and Sincire Esteem

I have the Honor to be

Sir Your most obed^t serv^t

HENRY MARCHANT.

SECRETARY HAMILTON.

It cannot be denied that in the applications for office under Washington's administration we find the germs from which the spoils system afterwards developed. We have seen that soldiers of the Revolution, having received little pay during the war and none at its close, conceived that the gratitude of the country for their services should take the substantial form of civil office, and that in the state where opposition to the new government had been most successful and pronounced federal patronage was extended only to the party which supported the government. It is easy to see how the idea that something besides mere fitness for office constituted a reason for appointment should have spread rapidly among the people in succeeding years. Unchecked by law and fostered by shrewd men who turned it to their own advantage, it grew steadily, and the applications for office under the administrations succeeding Washington's show how it advanced *puri*

passu with the advance in intensity of party spirit. Originally confined to applications to fill existing vacancies, it naturally extended to requests for the removal of officials simply because of the political opinions they held or the political activity they displayed. But this phase of it, at least, was steadily resisted by the appointing power, until Andrew Jackson surrendered to it.

GAILLARD HUNT.

“THE PEOPLE THE BEST GOVERNORS”

IN the history of the use of the written constitution as a basis of government, no period so brief has been marked by such activity in constituent proceedings and by such political path-breaking as the decade of the American Revolution. Yet of the seventeen constitutions, successful and other, whose appearance marks the ten years, 1775-84, those of but two states, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, were submitted to the action of the people. Elements both of the cause and of the result of this mode of procedure mark the contemporaneous literature in each of those states, and especially in Massachusetts, with its superior colonial press, its high grade of political intelligence, and its abundance of vigorous leaders.

The literary products of a political nature in those years may be grouped into three principal classes: the mass of articles in the press by the historian Gordon and his anonymous contemporaries; the large number of town votes, involving, especially in the years of the submission of constitutions, a large amount of practical detail as well as political theory; and, third, the work of the pamphleteers. Types of this last class appear in the aristocratic Carter Braxton's *Address to the Convention . . . of Virginia; on the Subject of Government in general, and recommending a particular Form to their Consideration*¹ and in John Dickinson's *Essay on a frame of Government for Pennsylvania*.²

In the same field there were produced by Massachusetts men two pamphlets of especial note, the widely influential *Thoughts on Government*³ of John Adams, and the locally powerful *Essex Result*⁴ of Theophilus Parsons. To the short list of these strongly

¹ Philadelphia, 1776; pp. 25; a copy is in the Library of Congress.

² Philadelphia, 1776; pp. 16; a copy is in the Library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

³ Philadelphia, 1776; pp. 28; in the Library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania is a copy in which is written, under date of New York, March, 1869: "Of the original edition this is the only copy I have ever seen. Geo. Bancroft." The text is reprinted in 4 *American Archives*, IV. 1136-1140; and see works of John Adams, IV. 189-200.

⁴ Newburyport, 1778; pp. 68; copies are in the Library of Harvard College; the text was reprinted in 1859 in the *Memoir of Theophilus Parsons*, by his son.

representative writings the addition is possible of a work bearing the imprint of 1776, and in its contents bringing out many of the opinions later so prevalent. Failure, after inquiry of thoroughly representative authorities, to locate in this country at present any but a single copy,¹ renders the full title worthy transcription:—

*The | People | the | Best Governors : | or a | Plan of Government |
Founded on the just Principles of | Natural Freedom. | Printed in
M,DCC,LXXVI.*

As in the other pamphlets of the kind, the authorship was not proclaimed; it differed from them in not indicating its place of publication. The latter omission is tentatively supplied in the catalogue of the British Museum as Boston, but, at present, no verification of such is offered.

By way of well directed apology the author in his preface says that to "help in some measure to eradicate the notion of arbitrary power, heretofore drank in, and to establish the liberties of the people of this country upon a more generous footing, is the design of the following impartial work, now dedicated by the Author, to the honest farmer and citizen." He puts himself squarely on record, and on the doubly "popular" side, by confessing himself "a friend to the popular government," and by also offering the willing confession, that to him it has appeared "that the forms of government that have hitherto been proposed since the breach with Great Britain, by the friends of the American States, have been rather too arbitrary." To counteract every leaning to the "arbitrary" was the business of a "popular" writer, and to remedy such an unwelcome tendency he would emphasize the immediate dependence of both legislative and executive officers upon the people; the people should elect directly the latter; to matters pertaining to the legislative branch, most of this early tract is devoted.

Turning to the important feature of the qualifications of legislators, the author goes to the extreme of liberality when he considers knowledge and social virtue sufficient qualifications for such positions. "Let it not be said in future generations," he goes on, "that money was made by the founders of the American states, an essential qualification in the rulers of a free people." As to the equally important matter of the basis of representation, his reason-

¹ In the Library of the Connecticut Historical Society; pp. 13. Mention of this pamphlet is found in the instructions given by the town of Wilbraham, Mass., to its Representatives, May 19, 1777: "That in all their proceedings they have Special recourse (as an assistance) to a Little book or Pamphlet Intituled, The People the best Governors or a Plan of Government, &c — . . ." Lincoln Papers, Library of The American Antiquarian Society.

ings teach that the basis of property disregards the equal liberty of all, that the basis of population would "puzzle the brain of a philosopher," while to him the basis of taxed lands seems least objectionable; at all events, he concludes, and in the conclusion reflects the striking conservatism of the time, that "a government is not erected for a day or a year, and, for that very reason, should be erected upon some invariable principles." The ratio of representation is taken up, and in this the writer repeats the extreme demand of the defenders of local rights in asserting the propriety and the right of every incorporated town to make annual choice of a member of the House of Representatives. This position he weakens only with the rather elastic suggestion that power be given to the General Assembly to grant larger representation to the more populous places.

In the author's time, and with his fellowmen, the most attractive as well as, provincially, the most important parts of government were the representative elements. The defence of one's rights as a voter, and the consideration of the broadening mass of political questions and rights arising from the possession of the suffrage, furnish their leading themes of thought and talk; various and abundant are the proposals relative to government by popularly elected representatives acting as legislators; and it is but characteristic of the time that the most systematic portion of the pamphlet in question is the series of distinct sections treating of these salient points of representative government. In the course of these the writer expresses what has been handed down most commonly from the mouth of another, when he suggests annual elections in all cases. He would, furthermore, extend this elective power of the people even to the choice at large, in town meetings, of judges of the Superior Court, as well as to the election by the counties of such officers as registers, judges of probate, and judges of the inferior courts. He is consistent in his liberality, even if still extreme, when he allows the franchise to every "orderly free male of ordinary capacity," twenty-one years of age, and of one year's residence in the town of voting; to this he suggests the qualifying addition that a year's absence from a town shall not entail disfranchisement if the person possesses in the town real estate valued at £100. To the possession of the franchise on such generous terms he would add the right to hold office, "unless something that has been said to the contrary;" but he opposes without qualification dual office-holding, therein touching but slightly on a question that was promptly to become one of importance. His vigorous expression on office-holding is rounded out by

the sentiment that would refuse admission of any one to office, unless he "professes a belief of, one only invisible God, that governs all things; and that the bible is his revealed word; and that he be also an honest moral man."

Later development of detail is foreshadowed in the suggestion of the publication of the Assembly's resolutions, and in the proposal to establish one "general proxy day" for the whole state. The early evolution of the important elements of representative government is typified by the author's allusion to the Assembly's power to act upon the credentials of its members, and by the attention he gives to the propriety of ascertaining the vestment of the power to entertain and act upon complaints against executive officers, a rude attempt at an impeachment process. The text does not lack indications of the author's familiarity with the accepted theorizing of his time; the later triple division of government, for instance, appears here, in a treatise bearing upon the executive and legislative departments, in his allusion to the desirability of a strict demarcation between executive and legislative functions. By such, and other, points of practice and theory, the writer of this pamphlet shows himself to have been a leader of thought even in the times of such political progress; his work in appearance was slight, but in essence it was profound. He preceded Parsons by two years, and began the propagandist education which the so-called *Essex Result* more elaborately and more perfectly continued, and which was crystallized by John Adams in more enduring form in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780.

HARRY A. CUSHING.

DOCUMENTS

[Under this head it is proposed to print in each issue a few documents of historical importance, hitherto unprinted. It is intended that the documents shall be printed with verbal and literal exactness, and that an exact statement be made of the present place of deposit of the document and, in the case of archives and libraries, of the volume and page or catalogue number by which the document is designated. Contributions of important documents, thus authenticated, will be welcomed.]

1. Diary of Richard Smith in the Continental Congress, 1775-1776.

THE following pages comprise the first half of a diary kept in 1775 and 1776 by the Hon. Richard Smith, delegate from New Jersey to the Continental Congress. The diary extends continuously from September 12 to October 1, 1775, and from December 12, 1775, to March 30, 1776. The second half will be printed in the next number of the REVIEW. The original manuscript is in the possession of Mr. Smith's great-grandson, J. F. Coad, Esq., of Charlotte Hall, Md., by whose kindness the REVIEW is permitted to print this daily record of events in Congress during a most interesting and important period.

Richard Smith was born at Burlington, N. J., March 22, 1735, of a Quaker family distinguished in the annals of the colony. He was a younger brother of Samuel Smith, treasurer and secretary of the council and historian of New Jersey. He was bred as a lawyer, and in or about 1762 was chosen recorder of the city of Burlington. For his correspondence with Tobias Smollett in 1763, see the *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. III. Mr. Smith married Elizabeth, daughter of Hon. John Rodman of New Bedford. He was for many years clerk to the House of Representatives in New Jersey. He was appointed a deputy from that State to the first Continental Congress, and on February 14, 1776, the Provincial Congress re-elected him for one year; but he resigned on March 30, for reasons indicated at the conclusion of his diary. His brother Samuel dying in this year, Richard was on October 17 appointed treasurer of the State of New Jersey. He resigned March 7, 1777, and retired to his country seat, called Bramham Hall. With other members of the Smith family he purchased a large tract of land on Otsego Lake, New York, and built there a handsome mansion

called Smith Hall, in which he lived from 1790 to 1799, when he removed to Philadelphia. While on a tour through the Mississippi valley, he died of a fever at Natchez on September 17, 1803. Mr. Smith was an honest, amiable, well-read, and cultivated man. Smith Hall, afterwards called Otsego Hall, was the early home of Fenimore Cooper, whose father, originally agent for the Smiths, acquired the property from them.

Of the items of information contained in this diary, but a small portion is to be found in the printed Journals of the Continental Congress. Two other published diaries relate to the same period in the history of Congress, — that of John Adams, printed, with his autobiography and some notes of debates, in his collected *Writings*, and that of Samuel Ward, published in Vol. I. of the *Magazine of American History*. But Smith's diary is much ampler than Ward's, and has a value independent of that of Adams, by reason of the fact that it relates largely to periods during which Adams was absent from Congress. Its importance and interest are therefore very considerable. Passages in Bancroft's *History of the United States*, Vol. VIII. (1860), pp. 313, 315, show that Mr. Bancroft had seen the diary. It is printed without abbreviation. The text here given has been collated with that of the original manuscript. The manuscript shows, by various indications, that it was copied, at some time later, but not much later, than April, 1776, from daily notes which had been taken in Philadelphia.

Tuesday 12 September 1775. I attended at Congress for the first Time since the Adjournment. M^r Hancock having a Touch of the Gout there was no President in the Chair. The Colonies of New Hampshire and N Carolina absent as also sundry Members from other Colonies. D^r Franklin read several Letters recieved today by Cap^t Falkner from London and informed the Members that he had some Bales of Household Goods on Board of Falkner, desiring the Congress's Leave to land them. no Objection to it only Willing and John Rutledge thought it irregular to do Business without a President and it was referred. M^r Gadsden and others moved for an Adjournment to 10 Tomorrow, which was complied with. 3 of the Georgia Delegates were present with M^r Peyton Randolph and the new Delegates from Virginia, their Credentials not yet delivered, and little Business hitherto done this session.

Wednesday 13th M^r President (Hancock) in the Chair. The Credentials of the Georgia, Virginia, and Maryland Delegates were read and accepted without any Objection. the Marylanders were the same as at the last Session. An Order was made that the Penns^a Delegates shall send off to Gen. Washington under a proper Guard, the remainder of his Money amounting in the whole to 700,000 Dollars, and they were at the same Time to send the Cloathing for Two Regiments lately seized at Philad^a.

Duane and Rob. R. Livingston came today from the Indian Treaty at Albany. another Treaty is about to be held at Pittsburg. D^r Franklins Goods allowed to be landed. a great Number of Letters and Papers were read, some from Gen. Washington giving a particular State of his Army they want Powder and Money — some from Gen. Schuyler stating his Situation; others from Col. Lewis Morris and Ja^r Wilson Dated at Fort Pitt recommending an Expedition ag^t Detroit to be conducted by Col. Arthur S^r Clair — others from Gov. Trumbull and sundry more.

Thursday 14 Sept. Letters read from Gen. Schuyler and others. Col. Francis sent the Journal of the late Indian Treaty at Albany to the Congress which was read. several Members from Virginia, Maryland, Jersey, N York and Connecticut added to the Penns^a Delegates appointed last Session to settle Accounts. The Georgia Delegates laid the Proceedings of their Provincial Convention before us cont^g a Petition to the King, another to certain Resolves and other Matters, and motioned for Leave to sell the Cargoes of Two Ships which were shipped without Knowledge of their Agreement of Non Importⁿ, and motioned also for Exportation of certain Articles under certain Limitations. these Motions were opposed by Chase and J. Adams and supported by Nelson, Houstoun and Dr. Zubley, the latter out of Humor with Chase. the Consideration of it was put off till Tomorrow. the proposed Expedition to Detroit canvassed and disagreed to and various other Matters.

Friday 15 Sept. Debates upon Indian Commissioners for the Middle Department Henry and Franklin being unable to attend at Pittsburg. Col. Lewis Morris and D^r Thos. Walker appointed to attend there Hac Vice. then the Affair of the Two Cargoes at Georgia referred from Yesterday, was largely agitated and in the End a Resolution drawn by Jay took place importing that the cargoes should be sold and the Proffits if any put into the Hands of the Georgia Convention or Com^{tee} of Safety to be applied in Defence of the Province. an incidental Matter took up some Time viz, Whether M^r Nelson should vote for Virginia he being the only Delegate present and whether any lesser Number than the Quorum shall represent any Colony. Mr. Nelson waved his Question, and the other went off without a Determination (since that Time no Colony votes without the Quorum present as limited by their Colony, some authorize 3. some 2 some one Delegate to give a Vote). Two of the Georgia Delegates are possessed of Homespun Suits of Cloaths, an Adornment few other Members can boast of, besides my Bro^r Crane and myself.

Saturday 16 Sept. the greater Part of the Time lost in considering Whether One Officer in our Army may be allowed to hold Two Commissions it was postponed, this was on read^g Gen. Washingtons Letters, other Parts of his Letters gone into and some small Matters settled.

Monday 18. Motion to appoint a Com^{tee} to procure 500 Ton of Gunpowder from abroad, together with 10,000 Stand of Arms 20,000 Gun Locks &c with power to draw on the Continental Treasury for the Amount, was carried by Vote, the Payment in Produce was opposed and the further

Consideration postponed. Com^o on the Accounts asked Direction how to settle them and the Matter left unsettled Motion by E. Rutledge to enlarge Col. Fenton a Prisoner in Connect^t from New Hampshire, opposed by Langdon and deferred. Letter from Gen. Schuyler giving an Account of his being at Isle aux Noix and postponing the Attack on Carlton at St Johns till he sounds the Canadians, after having a small Skirmish.

Tuesday 19 Sept. Arguments on Gen Schuylers Letter Whether he shall make a Post at Isle aux Noix and what is best to be done in his Situation, a Com^o of Three named by Ballot to report their Opinion. a Committee of 9 chosen by Ballot for procuring Arms and Ammunition agreed to banish John Fenton to England at his own Request after considerable Debate. D^r Franklin the PostMaster General desired the Delegates of New Jersey to nominate Deputy PostMasters throughout that Colony which we did accordingly.

Wednesday 20. An Expedition is on Foot against the Kings Forces in Canada via Kennebec under Col. Arnold from Washingtons Camp at Cambridge. Com^o brought in the Draught of a Letter from our President to Gen Schuyler. large Controversy on some Parts of it and particularly how far we shall express Approbation of his late Proceedings in retreating to Nut Island &c. Gen. Wooster with a considerable Detachment ordered to join Schuyler. this Morning a Letter in French was delivered to the President directed for Gen. Washington said to be from the Governor of Hispaniola. Whether the Letter shall be opened and whether by a select Com^o or by the President, were made Questions. the general Opinion seemed to be that the President should open it and the Secretary (Charles Thomson) translate it and if of a public Nature that it should be laid before Congress but it was dropt. Major Robert Rogers was at the State House today he has just come from England and is upon the Kings Halfpay.

Thursday 21 Sept. On a Question Whether Col. Armstrong or Col. Fry shall be Brig. Gen. in the Room of Pomeroy retired, the Colonies were divided 6 against 6—North Car^t being absent, consequently there was no Appointment. a Com^o of 5 was raised to consider of the best Method to convey 10 or 15000 Barrels of Flour and other Provisions to Gen. Wash^o much said about the Accounts of Col. Thompsons Riflemen, this Gent. had 5000 Dollars advanced to Him but his Acco^l are yet unpaid and one demands Interest. the Judge Advocate (Tudor's) wages were raised at his Request from 20 Dollars to 50 Dollars $\frac{7}{12}$ month.

Friday 22.—Andrew MacNair Doorkeeper's Acco^l ordered to be paid. a Letter from John Haring Chairman of the Com^o of Safety in New York and a Letter from Lewis Morris and James Wilson at Fort Pitt read. Major Rogers ordered to be discharged if Nothing appears ag^t Him but being a Half Pay Officer, he was arrested by the Com^o of Safety of Pennsylvania. a committee of 7 appointed by Ballot to consider the State of Trade in America. — W^m Shads Acco^l as Messenger ordered to be paid.

Saturday 23 Sept. a Letter from Tho^o Mifflin Quarter Master to the Army directed to W^m Barrell Merch^t was read, desiring Him to forward

Cloathing for the Army, the Congress took that Subject into Consideration and appointed by Ballot a Com^{ee} of 5 to supply the Two Armies with Cloathing to the Amount of £5000 sterl'g, and allowed each Quarter Master 5 ⁷/₈ Cent for selling out to the Soldiers.

Monday 25. A Com^{ee} of 3 named to draw an Answer to Gen Washingtons Letters. an Order passed for Payment of Acco^{ts} amounting to near 2000 Dollars. A committee of 13, one from each Colony (myself for N Jersey) was named for Settling what Accounts may come this Session. De Hart moved to restrict all Conventions and Assemblies from issuing any more Paper Money and to recall what they have done without Permission from hence, he was not seconded. On reading Wilson and Morris's Letters and other Papers Willing moved that the Congress would interfere in settling a temporary Line between Virginia and Pennsylvania, a Letter was read from the Delegates of those Two Colonies to the Inhabitants recomm'g Peace &c. several Orders of the King in Council Dated in June last relative to this Line were read.

Tuesday 26 Sept. Com^{ee} brought in a Letter to Gen Washington, in the Course of it E Rutledge moved that the Gen. shall discharge all the Negroes as well Slaves as Freemen in his Army. he (Rutledge) was strongly supported by many of the Southern Delegates but so powerfully opposed that he lost the Point. the Question of the Lines between Penn^a and Virginia agitated but Nothing determined. the Letters between Washington and Gage ordered to be published, then the Journal was read in Order for Publication and some Parts of it ordered not to be printed as improper for Public Inspection particularly all that was there about fortifying the Passes on Hudsons River and the Directions to the New Yorkers to arm themselves &c.

Wednesday 27. 160,000 Dollars ordered to be advanced to Connect^t in part of their Claim on the Congress. Willing from the Com^{ee} on Accounts asked whether a Chargé should be allowed made by the Com^{ee} of Northampton County in Penn^a for their Time and Trouble in settling certain Accounts, Mr. Willing was directed not to allow it. the Journal continued to be read and various Parts ordered not to be published, as the Instructions to Gen Washⁿ the Directions to the German Ministers &c. A Petition was read from Mess^{rs}. Purviance of Baltimore praying Leave to ship off a Cargo of Wheat which the late Storm prevented, refused and ordered to lie on the Table.

Thursday 28 Sept. No Congress. the Members dined by Invitation on Board of the Row Gallies which sailed down to the Chevaux de Frize near Mud Island and up to Point no Point. I amused myself all the Morning in M. du Simitiere's curious Museum.

Friday 29. Letters from Gen. Washington with a Return of his Army, about 19,000 effective Men who are to be disbanded in Dec^r by the Terms of Inlistment, he prays Directions how to keep or raise an Army. Expenses run very high, great Want of Powder and Money. Chief Part of the Morn'g was spent on a Motion to send a Com^{ee} of the Congress to the

Army to take proper Measures for the Winter Campaign, it passed in the Affirmative. some Powder said to be just arrived in Delaware our Com^{es} were desired to purchase it. above 80 of our Men have deserted to Gen. Gage in the Course of this Campaign accord'g to Gen. Wash^{rs} Dispatches.

Saturday 30 Sept. A Com^{es} of 3, viz Harrison, Franklin and Lynch was appointed by Ballot to proceed to the Camp at Cambridge. Harrison and Dyer had an equal Number of Votes, the Question was taken Whether the Com^{es} shall consist of 3 or 4, it was carried for 3. then the Vote was passed for a 3d Committee Man when Harrison was chosen. A Com^{es} of 5 was chosen to draw up Instructions for those Gentlemen. On Motion of D^r Franklin the Resolution that the Postage should be 20 $\frac{1}{2}$ Cent less than the Kings Postage was suspended till further Order, he being fearful that the reduced Postage at this Time may not be sufficient to pay all Charges. An Application was made from the Philad^a Com^{es} to give a Regulation Whether or not the Trade Coastwise shall be continued, and a particular Vessel bound to Gloucester in Mass^s Bay shall be permitted to proceed. after Debate the Matter was postponed. An Application was made to the Congress by Capt John MacPherson offering to destroy all the British Fleet at Boston if permitted — postponed — (I believe he was afterwards permitted to go and that he came back without effect'g any Thing) M^r Kean and Willing moved for Us to interfere in the Dispute between Connecticut and Penn^a for that there is immediate Danger of Hostilities between them on the Susquehannah — deferred till Monday. the Congress adjourned till Monday to meet at the Lodge in Lodge Alley because the election is to be then held at the State House.

1 October. I went to Burlington and attended as Inspector of the Press upon printing the £100,000 Loan Office Money and as Clerk of Assembly &c till

Tuesday 12th of Dec. when I went to Philad^a, and

Wednesday 13. I was at Congress The Delegates of Maryland and Georgia all absent. A Report from a Com^{es} was agreed to for equipping Thirteen Ships of War in several Colonies of 32 guns 28 and 24 Guns each and the Expence of each at an Average estimated at 66,666 $\frac{2}{3}$ Dollars. There is a secret Com^{es} whereof Gov^r Ward is Chairman and Tho^s M^r Kean Clerk, M^r Willing resigned his Seat in it and Robert Morris was chosen in his Room by Ballot Debates upon the Question Whether to make an Adjournment a few Days hence for some Time and to appoint a Com^{es} of One out of each Colony to superintend the Treasury and do the Business left unfinished, agreed to appoint such a Committee if an Adjourn^{ment} shall take Place and a Com^{es} was now nominated to prepare the Business of the other Com^{es}. Debates whether a Com^{es} of One out of each Colony shall be appointed to take Care of Naval Affairs in the Nature of a Board of Admiralty, postponed. Col. Lee moved to raise the Wages of able Seamen in the Armament now fitting out, from 50/ Penn^a Cur^r which had been before fixed by Congress, to £3 $\frac{1}{2}$ month and this was carried by Vote. able-bodied Landmen remained as before at 50/ $\frac{1}{2}$ month. the Order for

this day was to consider of giving Gen Washington Directions to storm Boston but various other Matters intervening it was put off till Tomorrow. M^cKean informed the Congress that many Persons in Penns^a, Maryland and Jersey sell Tea and drink Tea upon a Report that Congress had granted Leave so to do and he doubted Whether the Committees had Power to restrain them, a Day was fixed for considering the Matter (in April 1776 the Congress gave Leave to sell and use what Tea was in the Country, forbidding any further Importation of it) — M. Crane went home, Livingston and myself remain, Kinsey and De Hart have lately resigned.

Thursday 14 Dec^r Agreed to read the Minutes for the first Half Hour every Morning and also the preceeding Day's Transactions, accordingly the Journal was begun from the 5th of Sept^r last being the Time of Meeting after the last Adjourn^t Ordered that the Votes be sent to the Press as fast as they are revised several Matters were marked to be omitted as improper for Public Inspection. Much of the Day was spent upon an Answer to that Part of Gen. Wash^m Letters requesting Directions what to do with the Ships and Cargoes lately taken by our armed Vessels which was at length referred after learned Debates and Authorities from Vattel &c Much Altercation Whether a former Resolution of Congress had passed ag^t confiscating the Ships taken in Carrying Military Stores or Goods to Boston, the Colonies on Vote were equally divided upon it, however it was agreed that the Cargoes should be forfeited and that such Matters ought to be tryed in the Admiralty Court and by the Course of the Law of Nations not of the Municipal Law. The President (Hancock) applied to the Congress to release Lieut. Hay taken in Canada and now in Philad^a he offering his Parole of Honor to go Home to Scotland, resign his Commission and never serve against America, Lynch, Lee and others for it who were opposed by Nelson and several more, the Question passed in the Affirmative. the Journal of the Indian Treaty lately held by our Commissioners at Pittsburg lies before Congress and is not yet examined. A Member from each Colony (Crane for New Jersey, tho now absent) chosen by Ballot to procure or cause to be built and fitted out the 13 Ships of War yesterday ordered. Gadsden moved that the Congress should purchase a handsome Time Piece and set it up in the Assembly Room in the State House where we meet, as a Present for the Use of the Room, Wilson and Willing desired the Motion might be dropt as the Assembly expected no Consideration and it was withdrawn. Duane presented a Petition from Peter Berton of New York praying Compensation for a Vessel taken by the Men of War, it was referred by Ballot to Lynch, E. Rutledge and myself—

Friday Dec^r 15. Part of the Journal read and sundry Paragraphs as usual ordered to be omitted in Publication. Controversy Whether a particular Part shall be published, the Colonies were equally divided and the Part is to remain unpublished. Motion by Wilson that all Officers below a Major in the Continental Troops now raising in Penns^a shall be appointed by the several Committees of Correspondence and Observation was at length rejected and the Mode of Appointment there and in the Lower Counties set-

bled. A Letter and several Papers from some Indians on the Susquehannah, one of them named Jacob Johnson a Preacher, were read and the Indian Messengers ordered to be taken Care of at the Continental Expence. Robert Morris moved that a Com^o be nominated to consider of Ways and Means to bring in Gold and Silver and keep it in the Country, it is reported that Half Joes have already risen to £3-2-6, it was debated and postponed till Tomorrow. Col. Lee moved that George Mead & Co. of Philad^a may export from that City to Virginia 6000 Bushels of Salt and carry abroad Produce to the Amount from thence, opposed by Jay, Lewis and others and supported by Nelson, Wyth, Rob. Morris &c. it passed in the Affirmative 7 Colonies to 4 Com^o on Public Acco^o reported a Number of Accounts which were allowed and ordered to be paid (the mode of Payment is the President signs an Order to the joint Treasurers Hillegas and Clymer and then they pay the Money) several other Motions and Matters, for these Memoirs only contain what I could readily recollect.

Saturday 16 Dec. The Journal read and diverse Passages marked for Omission in Publication, on one Passage there was a vote whether to be printed or not, and the Colonies were equally divided. A Letter read from Gen. Washington advising of some Captures made by our Vessels and that he had released the President of the Island of S^t Johns and others who had been taken—A Com^o of 3 prepared a Speech to be delivered by the President to Cap^t White Eyes a chief of the Delaware Indians said to reside on the Muskingham, who was then introduced into the Congress accompanied by One of his Councillors and an Interpreter. the Chief was dressed in a good Suit of Blue Cloth with a Laced Hat and his Counsellor was wrapped in a Blanket, Cap^t White Eyes shook all the Members heartily by the Hand, beginning with the President and used the same Ceremony at his Departure, he stayed about an Hour, Our President delivered the Speech and the Chief answered by his Interpreter that he was well pleased to hear such a good Speech and meet his Brethren in the Grand Council Fire, that he would faithfully report to his Friends the kind Disposition of the Congress and proposed to stay in Town all Winter—he wanted a Clergyman, Schoolmaster and Blacksmith established among his People and said they inclined to embrace Christianity and a more civilized Way of Life. A Copy of the Congress's Speech was given to him when he withdrew, his Councillor said Nothing. A Motion to keep the Officers and Soldiers all together who were taken at S^t Johns, took up several Hours and was lost 5 Colonies to 5. A Motion was carried by a bare Majority to permit the Officers to go where they will within the former Orders of Congress till further Order. An Indian introduced Himself by the small Door into the House in the Midst of Debate, he was heard, he wanted Money and was promised a Supply. Several Reports from Committees were made, particularly one relative to Cap^t Motts Petition. Jefferson moved that no new Motions shall be offered after 12 oCloc without special Permission till the Order of the Day is satisfied, which was agreed to. the Com^o appointed to fit out the 13 Ships were impowered to draw on the Treasury

for 500,000 Dollars. Sundry other Things transacted in such a Hurry and Want of Order that I find it impossible to remember them.

Monday Dec. 18. The Minutes read and sundry Portions of them marked for Non Publication as usual. An Order passed to allow Cap^t Mott who takes Care of the Prisoners at Lancaster £30 more for his Expences. Major Preston allowed to go to Lancaster for 10 Days. Com^o of Lancaster impowered to take the Parole of the Officers who are prisoners there. Chief Part of the Day spent on the Dispute between Penns^a and Connecticut, various Resolutions were penned by the Delegates of each Colony but the matter was at last postponed. The Chief Point was Whether Pennsylvania shall have the Jurisdiction over the disputed Territory, She agreeing and her Delegates to pledge themselves for it, that private Property shall not be affected. they declared explicitly that they would not abide by the Determination of Congress unless this was conceded.—An Express arrived from Montreal with Letters from Gen. Montgomery, Col. Arnold and others. Eleven Vessels are taken near Montreal by our people who have also seized Brig. Prescot who had caused all the Powder to be thrown overboard, but the Ships contain plenty of Provision. Ethan Allen is sent to England in Irons. Col. James Livingston is about to raise a Regiment of Canadians in our pay for One Year. Arnold is near Quebec but has not Men enough to surround it and his Powder so damaged, that he has only 5 Rounds apiece. Montgomerys Soldiers very disobedient and many of them come Home without Leave. Frauds discovered in some of his Officers. Gen. Washⁿ in great Want of Powder and most of the Connect^t Troops have left his Army. Accounts of a Skirmish in Virginia and great Preparations in England for an Invasion of Us in the Spring. We sat from 10 oCloc till the Dusk of the Evening.

Tuesday Dec. 19. the Votes read and one Part only marked not to be made Public. agreed to request the Com^o of Safety of Penns^a to lend some Powder and Stands of Arms to the Ships of War now in this Port and almost ready to sail, on an Engagement to use all Endeavors to return by the 1st of February next. agreed to use the like Endeavors to return by that Time the Powder heretofore borrowed of New York. A Letter from Gen Washⁿ read, the Cruizers there (Massachusetts) have taken Two More of the Enemy's Ships. Debates upon that Part of the Generals Letters requesting Directions how to dispose of the Captures. A report from a Com^o read on that Head, an Amendment proposed by Mr. Wyth implying full Leave for any Person to seize all Ships of G Britain wherever found, was lost on a Vote 5 Colonies ag^t 4 and 2 divided, other Resolves were agreed to after Opposition, importing that all Vessels with their Cargoes including all Men of War, found any way assisting the Enemy shall be liable to confiscation. Some Powder just arrived here and at Dartmouth in N. England

Wednesday Dec. 20. The Votes read and no Passage erased. David Beveridge allowed to send out Produce for Arms and Ammunition. Cap^t Henry Livingston here, the Congress has ordered a handsome Sword to

be made and presented to Him as the Messenger, some Weeks ago, of the Surrender of Montreal. Some money allowed to the Rev. M^r Spencer and the Rev. M^r MacWhorter who are going at the Request of Congress, among the Regulators of North Carolina. Col. Harrison moved something relative to a Vessel or Two of War ordered heretofore to be fitted out at and for Virginia and a Com^o was appointed. Lord Dunmore is driven to his Ships by the Virginians. Gen Was^h's Letters proceeded upon and Answers agreed to. Debate Whether Butter shall be Continued to his Army and carried in the Affirmative. Motion by Jay to allow it to the rest of the Troops, denied or shuffled off. Application from 2 Inhabitants of Nantucket for Leave to import there various Articles of Goods was thrown out, they are allowed Firing and Provisions. Much Time spent on the Wyoming Dispute. Two resolutions were on the Table, one drawn by the Delegates of Pennsylv^a and the other by Connecticut, the former gave Pennsylvania the temporary Jurisdiction and the latter left each Party to exercise Juris^o on their respective Possessions. the Vote passed in Favor of the Connec^t resolve 6 Colonies to 4 and Mr. Livingston and myself declined voting for our Colony. the Delegates of Penns^a were very angry and discontented with this Determination of Congress.

Thursday Dec. 21. The Journal read and several Parts to be omitted as usual. M^r Rogers took his Seat as a Delegate for Maryland, Mr. John Penn from N Carolina had been here some Time. M^r Kean made report from the Com^o on Gen. Schuylers Letters it was partly considered and some Articles agreed to. By Ballot D^r Holmes was chosen Surgeon and M^r Halstead Quarter Master to the two Battalions (L^d Stirlings and Maxwells) Just raised in N Jersey. The Congress resolved itself into a Grand Com^o, Gov^r Ward in the Chair, to consider Whether to order the General to storm or bombard Boston in Answer to part of his Dispatches, it was made a Question Whether the Continent should indemnify the Losers. the Gen. says he can, if it is a hard Winter, destroy the Fleet and Army there and at any Rate he can bombard and ruin the Town when he pleases. the Chairman desired Leave to sit again. Leave for M. de Rigouville a Canadian Gent^o one of the Kings Legislative Council there, but now Prisoner at Trenton to come to Town to confess Himself to the Priest. James Livingston Esq^r Colonel and the other Officers of the new Canadian Regiment ordered to be Commissioned. The grateful Acknowledgments of the Congress ordered to Montgomery, Arnold and Easton. a N York Battalion which had returned Home and quitted their Officers ordered to be filled up. Wilson offered a Resolve importing that no more Connecticut People should settle at Wyoming till the Title of the Lands was adjudged, an Amend^t offered that no Pennsylvanians should settle there was voted out and the further Consid^o of Wilsons Resolve was adjourned.

Friday Dec. 22. the Journal read and some Passages marked. Letters from Lord Stirling and others read, my Lord gives an Account of the Situation and Condition of the 2 Battalions in Jersey and complains of the Increase of Toryism. The House again in Grand Com^o on the

Boston Affair and after much canvassing and sundry Propositions offered, the Vote passed for directing Gen. Washⁿ to destroy the Army and Navy at Boston in any Way He and a Council of War shall think best, even if the Town must be burnt, 7 Colonies to 2, one not fully represented and our Colony divided Wm. Livingston being ag^t the Resolution and myself for it. M^r Hancock spoke heartily for this Measure. Esek Hopkins Esq^r of Rhode Island (the same that commanded their Forces in Quality of Brig. General) appointed Commander in Chief of the American Fleet, he is to sail with the Ships of War now fitting out in the Port of Philadelphia and his Pay was voted to be 125 Dollars $\frac{7}{12}$ month 6 Colonies to 4, the latter thought the Pay too high. the Captains, Lieut^s and Warrant Officers as appointed by our Com^{rs} for Naval Affairs, were ordered to be Commissioned, the Question was put Whether any Allowance shall be made to the Admiral for Table Expences and negated by a large Majority. M^r Hopkins had very generously offered to serve without any Pay. Col. Lee and others gave Him a high Character. A Com^{rs} chosen to confer with the Indians now at the State House. Gen Schuylers Letters finished. Col Harrison the Delegate's Expences ordered to be paid for going lately to Maryland to promote the Equipment of some Frigates there. Motion by Gadsden to publish that Part of Gen Schuylers Letters where the Indians say that Guy Johnson invited them to take up the Hatchet against the Colonists and that he roasted an Ox and gave them a Pipe of Wine asking them to feast on the Flesh and Blood of a New England Man — was deferred, part of Conollys Letters was ordered to put in the News-Papers.

Saturday Dec. 23. the Journal read and some Parts marked not to be printed. Letter from L^d Stirling praying to be furnished with Powder and Six Field Pieces to defend some Vessels that have taken Shelter on the Coasts of Bergen and Essex, he has seized some Tories. Langdon reported the Proceed'gs of Himself and his Two Colleagues who have been sent by Congress to Ticonderoga, which were read and referred. their Expences reported by the Com^{rs} of Claims and Payment ordered. this Com^{rs} reported other Accounts which were allowed. Dyer read an Act of the Connec^t Legislature just passed, forbidding more Settlers to go on the Wyoming Lands on certain Conditions till further Order of that Assembly, Jay moved that it be recommended to Connec^t to extend the Time till further Order of this Congress, his Motion was carried 4 Colonies to 3 and the rest either divided or absent. the Delegates of Connecticut wanted to set aside this Vote because it was not carried by a Majority of the Colonies present, sed non allocavit. Duane gave in a Sett of Resolves for Sinking the last 3 Millions of Dollars, similar to those on the former 3 Millions and to be sunk in the same Years. they were all agreed to except the Time of Sinking which required further consideration. Debate Whether to admit Cap^t John the Tuscarora Chief and his Companions into Congress terminated in requiring the Com^{rs} to provide them with Food and Raiment for their Return Home. Col. Lee

and Cushing had Leave of Absence. Motion by Gadsden to publish the Part of Gen Schuylers Letters mentioned in Yesterdays Notes, was carried in the Affirmative Jefferson from the Com^o brought in a List of Business before Us. The Com^o on Cap^l Peter Bertons Petition reported that the Prayer of it ought not to be allowed and the Report was confirmed. The Prayer from New York for a large Loan of Continental Bills, disapproved of. the Delegates of Penns^a ordered to inquire what Progress is made in Exchanging Continental Bills for Gold and Silver. A Proposition or Report from a Com^o to send abroad a great Quantity of Produce to be returned in hard Money. A Com^o reported the Draught of an Answer to Gen Montgomerys Letters, advising a General Convention to be summoned in Canada and Delegates to be sent to our Congress &c. Some suppose we ought to keep up at least 3000 Troops in that Province. adjourned till Tuesday, Monday being Christmas.

Tuesday 26 Dec. Votes of Saturday read and Letters from Gen. Washington, from D^r John Morgan, from some New England men at Guadaloupe and other Letters. Duanes Propositions for sinking the last 3 Millions of Dollars were gone thro, the Vote was taken Whether that Money shall be sunk in the Years 1779, 1780, 1781 and 1782 as the first 3 Millions or in the Years 1783, 1784, 1785 and 1786 and carried for the latter. R. Morris informs that Treasurer Clymer says there is about £6000 in Gold and Silver now in the Treasury, Jay moved that it may be immediately sent off to Gen Schuyler which was agreed to. Report from a Com^o recommending inter alia that all Persons who refuse the Continental Bills shall be declared Enemies to their Country was postponed. A Day fixed to consider Whether on the 1st of March next to open the Exportation trade. Instructions to Lieut. Col. Irwin brought in by Jefferson and passed. this officer is to go from hence to Virginia immed'y with what Companies are ready. Report made from a Com^o recom'g that no more Paper Money may be made by Congress but that the Money wanted for the future may be borrowed and the Treasurers give Notes bearing Interest for 100 Dollars and upwards &c referred till Tomorrow. Jay moved that the several Comm^{os} of Inspection in each Colony should transmit to the Congress Accounts of what Produce has been and shall be exported, with the Returns of Arms and Ammunition and the Prices and Values and to this there was no Objection. An Order took place that all Soldiers in our Service may get their Letters franked and send them free from Postage. L^d Stirlings Letters were referred to William Livingston, Jay and S. Adams. several other Reports, Motions and Matters acted upon.

Wednesday 27 Dec. A Motion was made to allow an Importation of Salt into Virginia, an Amend^d offered that the Allowance should be general, this Amend^d was strongly opposed by Lynch and others, and large Argum^{ts} upon it, the further Considⁿ deferred till Friday Report from a Com^o that 6 Battalions are necessary to be raised for the Continental Service in Virginia (their Convention request 8 Battalions) it was largely controverted Whether they shall recieve the Pay of 6 Dollars

and Two Thirds allowed to the Troops in N. England the Two Carolinas and Georgia, or the reformed Pay of 5 Dollars p^{r} month allowed to the Forces raised in N York, N Jersey, Penns^a and the Lower Counties and at length the Determination was postponed by the Interposition of New Jersey according to our Rule that any One Colony may put off the Vote till another Day. Lieut. Hay allowed to negotiate a Bill of Exchange to pay his Expences home to Scotland. Complaints of the bad Behavior of some of the Captive Officers and Cap^t Motts Affidavit ordered to be taken thereon. An Allowance made of £3 p^{r} man for Cap^t Motts Guard on their Return Home to Connect^t. This Day, it is said, the King's Post finally stopt and the Postmasters shut up the Office.

Thursday 28. the Journals read and one Passage ordered for Omission. Report of Accounts from the Com^{rs} of Claims allowed. One of them was for maintaining some Prisoners in Goal, Harrison moved to enlarge them. Vote Whether the Virginian 6 Battalions shall have 37/6 or 50/ p^{r} month our Curr^t was carried for the latter if their Convention cannot raise Men cheaper, 3 Colonies only in the Negative, then a Motion was made by the Virginians that the 6 Battal^{ns} shall be altered to 8. sed non allocatur. there was a considerable Controversy on the main Question Whether the 6 Batt^{ns} shall be raised, it was carried in the Affirmative then a Motion was made by Wilson supported by M^cKean, W^m Livingston and others that the Middle Colony Troops shall have the same Pay, after some Time spent therein it was postponed. Some Talk about dispatching Bulls Regiment to Virginia. Montgomery some Weeks ago was created a Major General. 8000 Dollars advanced to the Com^{rs} of Safety of Penn^a towards Payment of Bulls Battalion. £5 advanced to the Indians for travelling Charges. A Com^{rs} of 5 ballotted for to consider the present State of N York. A Report brought in on the Petition of Cap^t Coffin and Paddock of Nantucket.

Friday 29 Dec^r Journal read and one or Two passages ordered to be omitted in Publication. A Petit^o from Simeon Sellick committed to myself, Col. Floyd and Francis Lightfoot Lee Esq^t. The House went into Grand Committee, Gov. Ward in the Chair, when it was agreed after much Debate to allow Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina to import as much Salt as their several Conventions or Committees of Safety think necessary from any foreign Country, and to export Produce therefor. Debates upon opening our Ports to foreign Countries after the 1st of March next, within the Terms of our Association, adjourned. A Recommendation to the several Assemblies and Conventions to encorage the Manufacture of Salt, was offered by D^r Franklin, agreed to and ordered to be published. R. Morris informed that a person offers to establish Salt Works on the Jersey Coast if the Congress will lend him £200. M^r Morris and Lynch were desired to inquire more particularly into it. M^cKean gave Information that a Quantity of Arms, Ammunition and Cannon is buried near Sir John Johnsons House with his Privy and that some Scotch and other Tories are there enlisted by the Enemy, a Com^{rs} of 3 was appointed to examine the Two Men who

brought the report to M^cKean and to ascertain the Fact as far as they can. Leave granted for a Lieut. a Prisoner, to come to Philad^a for 2 Weeks. Andrew Allen presented a Petition from a Number of the Inhabitants of Northampton and other back Parts of Pennsylvania intimating that they will not obey the Recommendations of Congress in the Wyoming Affair, this Petition gave much Offence and was ordered to lie on the Table. An Application from the Virginia Convention praying Means may be used for the Release of 3 Gentlemen, one of them a Delegate in that Convention named Robinson, lately seized by Lord Dunmore, left for Consideration (the brave Cap^t Manly retook and released these Gentⁿ on their Voyage to Gen. Howe at Boston)

Saturday 30 Dec. A Letter from Gen. Washⁿ with a packet of Letters just taken by Cap^t Manley in a Vessel sent with Provisions from Lord Dunmore to Gen Howe (the same Vessel mentioned in the last page) these Letters were from L^d Dunmore, one Mulcaster, said to be the Kings Natural Brother, Hon. John Stuart and many more Persons in the Southern Colonies One Col. Kirkland of S. Carolina was taken in this Vessel. The Letters took up most of the Day in the Perusal, the S Car^a Delegates pressed strongly to have the Originals delivered to them and the Virginia Delegates and the Congress to keep attested Copies, but it was opposed and the Letters referred to a Com^{tee} there was no Objection to those Delegates taking attested Copies. Gen. Washⁿ has sent to Gen. Howe a spirited Letter informing Him that whatever Severities are inflicted on Col. Allen shall be retaliated on Brig. Gen. Prescott and the like as to other prisoners, a Copy of the Letter was read in Congress. Another Letter was rec^d from Washⁿ recom'g 2 French Gentⁿ who offered to supply this Continent with Powder and these Gentⁿ being in Town our Secret Com^{tee} were desired to treat with them. Leave given to Major Preston to go for 2 weeks to Amboy, after much Opposition. A Guard of 5 men ordered immediately to convoy the hard Money to Gen. Schuyler and to take with them the Men who informed ag^t Sir John Johnson 40 Dollars allowed for their Expences A Com^{tee} directed to give proper orders to Gen Schuyler on this Occasion. Myself from the Com^{tee} made Report on Cap^t Simeon Sellecks Petition. He commands a small Privateer in Connect^t and lately took at Turtle Bay in the Sound, Kings stores to the Amo^t of £1500 lawful Money of Connect^t We allowed Him £100 like Money as a Reward for his Expences, Trouble and Risque, he gave up his Prize for the Continental Use. Debates Whether to stop Lieu^t Moncrief who some Months ago had Leave to go to England and is now about going. he was at length allowed to go.

Monday 1 January 1776. We finished reading the Journal and sundry Passages were marked, according to Custom as improper for present Publication. some Letters read. An Expedition ag^t S^t Augustine recommended to the Colonies of S. and N. Carolina and Georgia if the ruling Powers there shall deem it practicable. Report from the Com^{tee} on L^d Stirlings Letters partly agreed to, 1000 Dollars and 400 Weight of

Powder was allowed, and partly disagreed to and recommitted much was said upon that Part of it relative to disarming and securing the Tories in N Jersey and in case persons ordered to be secured by Authority would not surrender, then to put them to Death, during this Debate Wilson moved that all Persons in the 13 United Colonies who would not sign the Association should be disarmed and several written Propositions were made about disarming, securing and destroying such Tories as resisted an Arrest ordered by the present Authority. 2 Companies of L^d Stirlings Reg^t are to go to New Fort on the North River in the Highlands. the Report on Capt. Sellicks Affair confirmed. An Order passed to commission the Officers of the Battalions raised in N. Carolina. Motion by Dyer to pay a Gentlemans Expences who accompanied the 2 Frenchmen from Gen. Wash^{rs} Camp, was postponed. Motion by Langdon and Bartlett to take one Battalion of the New Hampshire Troops into Continental Pay was opposed by Jay and others and the Matter adjourned. A printed Copy of Mr. Rittenhouse's Oration was presented to each Delegate by the Philosophical Society of Philad^a and in Nov^r preceeding Mess^{rs} Norman and Bell dedicated to and furnished the Members with a neat American Edition of Swan's Designs in Architecture. A former Article or Order respecting Deserters was ordered to be published in the Papers. An Adjutant chosen by Ballot for Col Bulls Battalion.

Tuesday 2 Jan^r Before Congress met I attended the Com^{os} of Claims. Some Acco^{ts} of Cap^t Mott, Egbert Dumond and others for Subsistance and traveling Expences of the Prisoners from S^t Johns, were adjusted, these Expences run very high. Yesterdays Minutes read. Agreed to write to Gen Schuyler ordering Him to confine Brig. Gen. Prescott now at Kingston in Ulster County, till further Order, acquaint'g Him, Schuyler, of the reason viz the ill Usage of Col. Ethan Allen. We did not order the Prisoner into Irons because it is not quite certain how Allen is treated. Some Acco^{ts} were reported by M^r Willing Chairman of the Com^{os} of Claims which were passed. Gadsden moved to add a Friend of his to John Rutledge and Middleton now in S. Carolina to whom the Dispatches of Congress relative to the Attack on S^t Augustine are to be directed, and he further moved for Leave to repair to S. Carolina he being Commander in Chief of the Militia there where an Attack is apprehended. these Motions were opposed by his Colleagues Lynch and E. Rutledge and others and were carried in the Negative. Bartlett and S. Adams were added to the Com^{os} of Claims. the Com^{os} on L^d Stirlings Letters again made Report which being discussed and amended was passed and that Part of it concerning the future Treatment of the Tories was directed to be published in the News Papers. The Report from the Com^{os} on Cap^t Coffin and Cap^t Paddocks Petition whereby they allowed Nantucket to import 7000 Barrels of Flour ~~7~~ Annum, there being on that Island about 7000 People, was objected to and at length rejected. It is said We have no less than 51 Battalions now raised or ordered so to be in the 13 United Colonies. a thin Congress today, not more than 30 Members.

Wednesday 3^d. I was on the Com^o of Claims sundry Acco^o were there adjusted as Cap^t Motts, the Signers of the first 3 Millions of Dollars whose Acco^o came to £437-2-8½ Penns^a Cur. and some others. In Congress the Report on the State of New York was considered. Col. Nat Heard of the Minute Men at Woodbridge and Col. Warterbury of Connecticut are ordered to take each a large Body of their Men and meet at a Day agreed on in Queens County Long Island and there disarm the Tories and secure the Ringleaders who it is said are provided with Arms and Ammunition from the Asia Man of War, and other Parts of the Report agreed to as was a Report from the Secret Com^o implying that a large Quantity of Produce shall be exported for a Supply of Sail Cloth, other Cloth, Blankets, Needles, Military Stores and other Necessaries to fit out our Fleet and Army. A Report recommend'g to send out Produce to the Amount of 160,000 Dollars for the Importation of Gold and Silver, was rejected after thorough Discussion. M^r Alexander from Maryland took his Seat. Reports of Accounts from the Com^o of Claims confirmed. A Letter was recieved from M^r Hanson Chairman of a Com^o in Maryland with Conolly and Cameron Two Prisoners. Smith made his Escape. The Com^o of Safety here were desired to secure and take the Examination of these Criminals and a Letter was directed to be sent to the Com^o of Frederick County to search a certain Saddle for Conollys Instructions. Intelligence of this Saddle had been rec^d from Gen. Washⁿ from whom a Letter was now rec^d inclos'g a Copy of Gen. Howe's Answer to our Generals spirited Requisition about Allen. An Answer was made up and sealed to L^d Stirling inclosing Copies of the necessary Papers. Application was made from the Com^o of Philad^a asking Advice Whether to secure L^d Drummond and Andrew Elliot now in Philad^a. some Members gave them good political Characters and they remained unhurt. 4 Colonels were ballotted for to command the 4 Battalions now raising in Penns^a These officers were chosen as the Delegates of that Province recommended viz 1 Arthur S^t Clair who ranks next to Col. Bull 2. John Shee 3 Anthony Wayne 4 Robert Magaw. they had been ballotted for with 4 others in the Com^o of Safety and had the highest Votes.

Thursday 4 Jan^r Com^o of Claims allowed the Acco^o for keeping Conolly and his Associates and bringing them from Maryland to Philad^a. Congress agreed to raise a Sixth Battalion in Penns^a and in the Counties of Cumberland and York, the People there offering their Service, and that one Comp^y in each of the Six Battalions shall consist of Riflemen. the Lieut. Col^l to the 4 Penns^a Battal^l were now appointed and an Order entered for settling the Rank of Officers chosen in one Day viz. as they are entered on our Journals and their Commissions are to be numbered. The said L^t Col^l are 1. Lambart Cadwallader 2. Wm. Allen Jun^r 3 Francis Johnston, 4 Joseph Penrose. Reports from the Com^o of Claims allowed. Debates on the Report of the State of N York, great Fault found with the Fort now constructing in the Highlands under the Auspices of Bernard Romans the Engineer, as too large and expensive and ill calculated to annoy the Enemy. Maps produced and Proceedings of the N York Con-

vention thereon read. M^r Palmer attending on their Behalf, ordered that he be heard Tomorrow Morn'g. a Vessel or Two of War are now fitting out in Maryland on Acco^t of the Congress. I rec^d from the Continental Treasury the 1000 Dollars lately advanced to our Com^{tee} of Safety for purchasing Arms for the Use of the Continental Troops raised here. I wrote to Samuel Tucker Esq^r, Presid^t of the Com^{tee} of Safety and forwarded the Dispatches and Articles of War to L^d Stirling. the Majors of the 4 Penns^a Battalions were appointed viz. 1 Jos. Wood 2. Geo. Nagle 3. Henry Bicker 4. Nicholas Hausaker. A Commissary ordered for the 3 companies gone to Accomac (they were afterwards recalled) Major Preston allowed the Liberty of other Captive Officers. A report made on the Allowance proper for Officers Prisoners.

Friday 5. On my Motion it was resolved that 10,000 Dol^r shall be struc to exchange ragged and torn Bills, under the Inspection of the Persons now forwarding the last 3 Millions and of the same Denomin^a. A Collection of Money was made among the Delegates for M^r Lovell now in Boston Goal and a Requisition agreed to be made through Washington to Howe, to exchange that Gent^l for Major Skeene Sen^r it had been proposed to present Him with 100 or 200 Doll^r but that was dropt as a bad Precedent. M^r Palmer and Cap^t — from New York called in and examined as to the Fortifications to be built on Hudsons River, this Affair took up several Hours and was at last, after passing a Resolⁿ to abandon the Works at Martilers Rock with Romans the Projector of them and to fortify at Poplopens Kill, referred back to the N. York Convention or Com^{tee} of Safety to execute this Resolve as they may think fit. the Delegates of N Jersey and Connect^t were desired to take the proper Steps for carry'g into Execution the Resolves of Yesterday about disarming and seizing the Tories on Long Island. some Acco^{ts} passed and the New York Report agreed to. A long Memorial from the Town of Newport was presented pray'g Leave to continue to supply the British Men of War with Provisions otherwise they fear immediate Destruction, this was postponed. The Com^{tee} of Phil^a prayed Directions about selling and drinking Tea, which was deferred. Benj^l Davies eldest Lieut. in Col. Bulls Battalion was chosen by Ballot a Captain vice W^m Allen Jun. promoted to a L^t Col-ship. An Application from the Wife of Lieut. Tyler of Connect^t now a Prisoner on Board of the Men of War near N York requesting Means may be used for exchanging Him, Deferred. Our Secret Com^{tee} have sent to Europe for some able Engineers much wanted now in America. it is said a Specimen of the Saltpetre Rock in Virginia was sometime past produced in Congress. Quaere Whether it answers Expectation.

Saturday 6 Jan^r Minutes of yesterday read and Letters informing of a considerable Quantity of Powder just arrived at Egg Harbor, some of it consigned to the Congress by Jonat^l Parsons, some consigned to Pelatiah Webster and some to another Person in Philad^a. Congress agreed to purchase the whole and the Secret Com^{tee} are desired to have it brought here under a Guard commanded by a Lieut. a Letter of Thanks directed

to be sent to M^r Parsons for his Attention to the Public Welfare. I sent off the Dispatches to Col^l Waterbury and Heard by M^r Palmer of N York province. A Letter was recieved from a French or Swiss Officer at Lisbon offering his Service and another or Two from other Foreign Officers, these were committed to the Secret Com^{ms}. The Memorial from the Town of Newport was agitated for several Hours and at last referred generally to the Assembly of Rhode Island. M^r Gadsden from the Naval Com^{ms} reported the Rules for Distribution of the Prize Money which were confirmed with one Alteration viz, That the Rewards for extraordinary Exertions shall not be paid out of the Continental Share of the Captures. Letters just rec^d from Gen^l Schuyler, Montgomery and Wooster pressing for an immediate Supply of hard Money and for more Troops otherwise they fear all will be lost in that Quarter. Montgomery was before Quebec on the 16th of Dec^r with 8 or 900 effective Men and some Canadians and had planted by Way of Feint a Battery of Cannon ag^t the Lower Town but intended his chief Efforts by Way of Storm ag^t the Upper Town. Monday Morn'g was assigned to consider this Business and Nothing else to interfere, the Delegates to be upon Honor to meet punctually at 10 oCloc. A Report respecting Canada was produced. D^r Franklin shewed me today a Pattern Paper containing 6 or 8 Sorts of Cloths lately manufactured at one or both of the Company Manufactories of Philad^a. Col^l Heard and Waterbury are to disarm the Tories of Queens County on Oath that they have delivered up all their Arms and ammunitⁿ and to imprison all that refuse the Oath, these Tories are not to quit their County without a Pass certifying that they are welldisposed to the American Cause — all to be considered as Tories who voted ag^t sending Delegates to the present N York Convention no Lawyer may bring an Action for them. Quere Whether People are not forbid to trade with these Tories. the Col^l are also to seize certain Persons named in a List and confine them till further Order of Congress. 500 Doll^s and 200 Lb. of Powder allowed for the Expedition (which was afterwards well executed by the Jersey Militia only those of Connect^t being countermanded)

Monday 8 January. Votes of Saturday read as were Letters from Gen^l Schuyler and Montgomery. the latter, it seems, was before Quebec the 5th of Dec^r and expects Success in his intended Storm, he demands 10,000 Men to defend Canada. A Report consisting of several Articles about that Country was agreed to, then it was voted, after much Consideration that 9 Battalions shall be destined for the Service in Canada including the Canadian Regiment there which is intended to consist of 1000 Men under Col. James Livingston. A Battalion consists of about 726 Officers and Men. One of these Battalions is to be raised in New Hampshire, One in Connect^t, One in N York. Col. Maxwells to be sent out of N Jersey, Col Bull's to be sent out of Penns^a and a new One to be raised there, Two to be reinlisted from the Corps under Montg^r and Arnold. this Business took up the whole Day but previous to its coming on and after the Letters were read, Gadsden moved and was seconded by me that

Col. Arnold may be made a Brigadier Gen. and recieve the Thanks of the Congress for his extraordinary March from Cambridge to Quebec and for his other spirited Exertions, this was debated and put off till Tomorrow. The Kings Speech of the 27th of October (1775) arrived to day as did a Report that a large Fleet was seen at Sea with 5000 Troops on Board, but some think this premature. An Express came with Letters from Baltimore inform'g that L^d Dunmore has destroyed the Town of Norfolk in Virginia. 300 Barrels of Powder just arrived in New York as did 8 Ton the Week before. 50 or 60 Tons of Saltpetre arrived here at Phil^a in Masons Vessel, the 3 Comp^t under L^t Col. Irwin of Bulls Battalⁿ gone to Accomac are to return soon and be replaced by Minute men from Maryland.

Tuesday Jan. 9. the Votes read and some Letters, one of them from Matthew Tilghman Esq. President of the Convention in Maryland desiring our Two small armed Vessels the Hornet and Viper at Baltimore may convoy to the Capes of Virginia some Vessels going with Provisions on Acco^t of the Congress, to get Necessaries for our Fleet and Army, this was agreed to and Directions are to be given to Admiral Hopkins to meet them. A Letter from L^d Stirling enclosing a Packet which he caused to be intercepted near Elizabeth Town containing 1. A Letter from Gov. Franklin to Lord Dartmouth inimical to the Americans which inclosed a printed Journal of Congress, an Extract from the Votes of the Jersey Convention, a Paper from New England, a Copy of a Petition to our Assembly against Independency, the manuscript Votes of last Session, with his Messages and the Councils and some Newspapers as also some Notes of the Speeches made in our Assembly by John Dickinson John Jay and Geo. Wyth when they lately attended there from the Congress and prevailed with the Assembly to drop their Petition to the King, there was likewise a Copy of John De Harts Resignation, divers of these papers were in the Hand Writing of Cortland Skinner Speaker of the Assembly who immediately upon this Discovery fled on Board of the Ship Dutchess of Gordon, those copied by Him were the Extract, the Paper from N England, the Notes and the Resignation, the Petition was in Dan^l Ellis's Hand. 2. A Letter from Cortland Skinner to his Bro^r W^m full of strong Toryism. some Letters were in the Packet directed to M^r Gage which L^d Stirling opened and sent forward. After going thro other Business the Congress directed that the Presid^t shall write to L^d Stirling to seize Cortland Skinner and to keep Him confined till further Order from hence and that he be examined before the Com^o of Safety in N Jersey who are to have a Copy of his Letter and his Examinⁿ is to be transmitted to this Congress. Nothing was done respecting Gov. Franklin. The Com^o of Claims reported some Acco^t for Cartage of Powder, to Cambridge and Accounts of Abr^m Hunt and others which brought on a Discourse of the extravagant Living of the Captive Officers at Trenton, a Motion was made that they be notified that it shall be at their own Expen^c which was committed to W^m Livingston, Floyd and Dyer. The Report on Gen. Schuylers Letters was taken up, some of the Articles agreed to and some recommitted. Cap^t

Lamb of the Artillery was rewarded with the Rank of Major and to be allowed 50 Dollars $\frac{7}{8}$ Month from the 1st of January Instant and to be Commandant of the Artillery in Canada, the PayMaster with Schuylers Army to be allowed Two Deputies. John MacPherson aidduCamp to Montg^r promoted to be a Major, a Conductor of Artillery appointed, distinct from the Commandant,—the Promotion of Arnold was again moved and deferred till Tomorrow. Wilson moved and was strongly supported that the Congress may expressly declare to their Constituents and the World their present Intentions respecting an Independency, observing that the Kings Speech directly charged Us with that Design, he was opposed but Friday was fixed for going into that Affair. Several Members said that if a Foreign Force shall be sent here, they are willing to declare the Colonies in a State of Independent Sovereignty. M. Pliant one of the Two Frenchmen in Treaty with our Secret Com^{rs} offers to supply the Continent from France with all Sorts of Goods and Military Stores at the price common in France and hints that our Ships may trade to that Kingdom by Connivance and that they are willing to send their Bottoms here, he treats apparently in Behalf of a Company at Paris and he stays here till his Partner returns from thence. the Militia ordered to be discharged from the Fort at the Highlands on Hudsons River. 500,000 Dollars voted to be sent to Gen Washington through the Penns^a Delegates. the President desired to write to Gen. Schuyler inter alia requiring Him to try Lieut. Halsey at a Court Martial. Col. Van Schaick, L^t Col. Yates and Major Gansevoort are to be continued in the Service and appointed to that Battalⁿ now to be raised in N York. A Communication is to be opened between Skeenesborough and Fort Anne and Wood Creek to be cleared out.

Wednesday 10 Jan^y the Votes of Yesterday read. 35,000 Dollars allowed to Thomas Lowrey the Jersey Commissary in Addition to what he has had, for fitting out L^t Stirlings and Maxwells Troops. the Com^{rs} of Safety in Penns^a desired to fit out with Necessaries their 6 Battalions. A Third Battalion ordered to be raised in N Jersey on the same Terms with the other Two, this was on Motion of W. Livingston. Duane moved that 4 more Battalions may be raised in N York, after Discussion it was referred to a Com^{rs} of 5 now named to consider what Force is necessary to be raised in the 13 United Colonies. The Two vacant Brigadierships were now filled up, the Penns^a Delegates, Wilson in particular, contended strenuously for Col. Thompson but Major Gen. Fry of the Massachusetts was elected 9 Colonies to 3. Benedict Arnold Esq^r was unanimously elected the other Brig. The Field Officers of the 6th Penns^a Battalion were fixed, viz W^m Irvin Col. Tho^s Hartley L^t Col. and James Dunlap Major. the Resolution for subduing the Tories on Queens County was now altered so that no Troops are to go from Connect^t but Heard is to call on L^t Stirling for 3 of his Companies, I sent the Dispatches to Col. Heard by Cap^t Morris. Hooper read Two Letters from North Carolina informing of Comotions there between the Whigs and the Tories of the back Parts. Foreign Goods begin now to come in, I bought some Linnen from S^t Eustatia at 4/ $\frac{7}{8}$

yard. A Report passed concern'g the proper Necessaries for Maxwells Battalion about to march to Canada who are to have the same Pay, 50/ 7th Month for the Privates, as the Northern Forces, to commence from the Time they set off. the Com^{rs} of Claims reported some Acco^{ts} and among them Commissary Lowreys.

Thursday 11 Jan^r. The Com^{rs} of Claims settled the Acco^{ts} of the Commissioners of the Northern Department of Indians, the whole Expence of the late Treaty at Albany was about £3300. In Congress a Recommendation was directed to the New York Convention to release by Exchange Lieut. Tyler of Connecticut now a Prisoner on Board of the Asia. A Com^{rs} was appointed to give proper Instructions to the Officers on the recruiting Service. A Report from the Com^{rs} on Paper Currency was ably argued for 4 Hours, the Report recommended that the present 6 Millions of Dollars be called in and large Notes issued to that Amount bearing Interest, with sundry other Particulars, but a Proposition of Duane's took Place implying that all who refuse to take the Continental Curr^t shall be treated as Enemies to their Country, a subsequent Resolution was voted out importing that the several Assemblies, Conventions and Committees of Safety shall take Care to put this Resolve in Execution. A Letter from Owen Jones Provincial Treasurer here to a County Treasurer was read desiring as little Congress Money might be sent to him as possible for that he could not change it into Province Bills and a Letter from another Person fearing a Depreciation. Something was said about preventing Counterfeits.

Friday 12. the Minutes read. the Com^{rs} of Claims made some Reports of Accounts. M^r W^m Livingston made a Report on the Mode of maintaining the Captive Officers at Trenton which being amended was passed, they are to pay their own Expences, to be removed to some other Place and be allowed 15/ 7th Week which they are to repay already having had Leave to draw Bills of Exchange for their Subsistence. In Grand Com^{rs} Gov^r Ward in the Chair, the Point was Whether to open Trade to Foreign Countries on the First of March next, wherein much Ability was displayed for several Hours and at last it was postponed for a Week, then the Com^{rs} went on the Affair of allowing the Sale of what Tea is on Hand which was strongly advocated by M^r Kean and others and as strongly opposed by D^r Franklin, Lynch &c and the result Delayed till Tomorrow.

Saturday 13 Jan^r the Votes read and Letters from Gen Wash^r, Governor Trumbull and others. An Application from Connect^t for more Money was objected to because no Accounts have been exhibited and the Motion was withdrawn. Some Amend^{ts} proposed by Duane to the Resolutions of Thursday concerning the Credit of the Continental Bills, were lost on a Vote. Several Petitions were presented desiring a new Arrangement of some Officers in Bulls Battalion and that Morgan may be preferred to the first Lieutenantcy, this last was agreed to but the other discounted. Debates Whether Bernard Romans shall be called in and examined about his Fortifications on Hudsons River were terminated in a Reference to 5 Members.

Monday 15. Letters from Washington, Montgomery, Arnold and others. 3 Letters from L^d Stirling enclosing Letters between Gov^r Franklin and Lieut. Col. Winds, they were on the Point of removing the Gov^r to genteel Lodgings at Eliz^t Town till the Pleasure of Congress is known, this Business was referred to W^m Livingston and 4 others, and a Com^o of 3 appointed on Wash^g Letters then the House went into Grand Com^o Gov^r Ward in the Chair, on the Permission to sell and use what Tea is in the Country, it was battled for divers Hours with much Heat and much Oratory and at length it was carried ag^t granting any Permission by 7 Colonies to 4. (however the Advocates for this Measure carried their point in March or April following). A Paragraph of a Letter from Peter Timothy was read whereby it appears that any Two of the S. Carolina Gent^o are constituted a Quorum. A Com^o was appointed of which Wisner was Head, to provide for Casting Cannon for the Land and Sea Service. I wrote to M^r Kinsey this Even^g, inclosing Copies of Gov^r Franklins and Cortland Skinners intercepted Letters. it was recommended to the Com^o of Safety of Penns^a to discharge such Privates as they pleased that were lately cast away on Board of the Transport at Egg Harbor. In the Morning the Com^o of Claims settled several Acco^s as Hiltzheimers for Expresses and others, Expences run very high.

Tuesday 16. January. Mess^{rs} Walcott and Huntington from Connecticut took their Seats. A Report passed from the Com^o on Gen. Wash^g Letters, to allow the Paymaster at Cambridge to draw upon the Continental Treasurers for any Sum not exceeding a Months Pay of that Army, to allow Him to reinlist the free Negroes, to continue Col Gridley as Chief Engineer, to appoint a Chaplain to every 2 Battalions and the Pay of such Chaplain fixed at 33 $\frac{1}{2}$ Dollars $\overline{\text{p}}$ Month &c A Tender was asked for and allowed our Naval Armament under Admiral Hopkins. Duane and E. Rutledge were desired to rectify a Mistake in the Journals now printing, as to the Date of the Bills of Credit. The Report was made from the Com^o on the Number of Troops necessary, they recommend 4 new Battalions to be raised in New York and one in N Carolina, the latter was confirmed and a day named to consider the former. considerable Arguments on the Point Whether a Day shall be fixed for considering the Instrument of Confederation formerly brought in by a Com^o it was carried in the Negative, D^r Franklin exerted Himself in Favor of the Confederation as did Hooper, Dickinson and other ag^t it. Two Applications from French or other Foreigners for Employ in our Service, were referred to the Com^o for nominating fit persons for Officers. a French Vessel just arrived here with Powder. it is reported that they are fitting out 4 or 5 Privateers or other Vessels of War in So. Carolina and their Agent is now in this City on his Way to New England to engage 500 Seamen he is empowered to offer such high Terms that the S. Carolina Delegates acquainted Congress with it least it should prejudice our Service and a Com^o was chosen to consider the Matter. A Vessel is about to sail from Philad^a with Produce for Bermudas to procure Powder and if it belongs to the King to seize it

by Force, if there is none there She is to go to New Orleans, Carthagena or to a noted Port near Carthagena or elsewhere and if She cannot get Ammunition the Captain is to obtain hard Money. the Secretary was desired to make out a List of all Committees and their Business and leave it on the Table Col Kirkland with his little Son is brought here and secured in Goal he was offered the Choice of having his Son with him or that the Boy should be put to Colledge, he chose the former. A Petition was presented from Benjamin Randolph of Chesnut Street praying Leave to raise a Troop of Light Horse for Continental Service, it was opposed by E. Rutledge and neglected or rejected.

(To be continued.)

2. *The First Colonial Bishopric, 1786.*

[For the following document the readers of the REVIEW are indebted to Hubert Hall, Esq., F.S.A., of the Public Record Office, Director and Hon. Secretary of the Royal Historical Society. For the subject-matter of the document, see also Dr. Brymner's *Report on the Canadian Archives*, 1894, pp. 405, 407, 443, 445, 447-449. The See thus established was the first colonial bishopric of the Anglican Church. — ED.]

The following original Petition of the Anglican primate and the Bishop of London (to whose see the colonies were relegated) contains many allusions to a state of the Church in North America which was sufficiently notorious in its own day. The document itself is undated, but we may with some confidence assign its date to the year 1786 on the following grounds:—

In the first place, the signatures of the bishops prove that the date must lie between the years 1783 and 1787, since John Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury, was elected in April, 1783, and Robert Lowth, Bishop of London, died in November, 1787. So much, at least, is certain. It might, indeed, be thought that the tone of the Petition would indicate a date previous to the concessions made by the Anglican bishops to the Episcopal Church in the United States, but it is more convenient to suppose that the concessions in question were a further inducement to the erection of an Anglican bishopric in British North America. There was no necessity to refer to the existence of a neighboring Episcopal Church in the United States, since it was perfectly understood that ordination at the hands of its bishops was even more improper than that which the American clergy once sought from the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and in this sense the American

episcopacy was ignored equally with the Scotch in the official correspondence of the period.

Therefore, in spite of the significant reference to the "late events" in America, and even of the admitted existence of a strong agitation in favor of an Anglican bishopric in Nova Scotia during the early part of 1783, we must regard the original correspondence contained in the Colonial Office Records as absolutely conclusive with regard to the latest date which can be assigned for this Petition, namely, August 18, 1786, whilst it will be seen, from the same source of information, that the Petition must have been presented not long anterior to this date.

As early as March 24, 1783, a memorial was presented by eighteen clergymen assembled at New York, advocating the erection of a colonial bishopric for Nova Scotia. Two days later a second memorial was subscribed recommending Dr. Chandler as the first bishop of the proposed see. Both these memorials were forwarded by Governor Carleton in his despatch of April 11, 1783, and this correspondence, with a few more papers relating to the proposed bishopric, has been bound up in a volume of Nova Scotia papers for the year 1786, on the strength of an identical endorsement of each paper stating that it was read at the council on August 23, 1786, and having been referred thereupon to the Committee for Trade (which continued the functions of the old Board of Trade, abolished in 1782), was read there on November 26 following.

Now amongst these papers of 1783 is a rough office copy of our Petition endorsed in a precisely similar form. But in this case it is clear that the Petition itself was referred to the committee, and that the correspondence of 1783 was merely appended to it for purposes of reference. Thus, although the Order in Council of August 18, 1786, above referred to, merely directs that "the several papers relative to the establishment of an episcopate in Nova Scotia be referred," etc., yet the report of the committee, dated May 5, 1787, states that whereas the king was pleased by an order in council, dated August 18, 1786, "to refer unto this committee a representation . . . of John Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Robert Lord Bishop of London," and that having taken the same "into their most serious consideration, together with the correspondence which passed in the year 1783 . . . on this subject," etc. Moreover, the loyalist emigration, which is so pointedly referred to in the Petition, was not accomplished before. In any case the evils described in the Petition had not been redressed as late as November, 1785, the date of a remarkable report on the state of the Church in Canada, made by an experienced

missionary and confirmed by him in February, 1786. It would seem likely, then, that the agitation of 1783 was revived in London by the powerful missionary party in the spring of 1786, with the result that this Petition was formally presented by the bishops, and was read before the council, as we have seen, in August of that year. Being then referred to the Board of Trade, it remained under consideration by that department between November, 1786, and May, 1787, when a favorable report was made which was followed, after the usual formalities, by the patent to the first bishop, and the proclamation of the new episcopate in September, 1787.

HUBERT HALL.

TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY¹

The humble Representation of John Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Robert Lord Bishop of London
Sheweth

That in Consequence of the late Events which have separated many of the American Colonies from their Connection with the Church of England, a very large Number of the Episcopal Inhabitants have removed from thence into your Majesty's Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

That to provide for the Religious Instruction and Spiritual Comfort both of those Emigrants and of the other Inhabitants of those Provinces in the Communion of the Church of England, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel have appointed as many Missionaries as the State of their Revenues in Aid of the Allowances granted by Parliament would enable them to support.

That from hence they derive the pleasing hope that those Colonists will be prevented from falling off from the Purity of their Profession untill a more effectual Provision is made for preserving them in perpetual Union and Conformity with the national Church which we are fully persuaded will be the best means of promoting their Temporal as well as Spiritual Welfare; a Measure which we humbly conceive from the present unsettled State of those Countries, cannot take place too soon; for while Christians of every other Denomination there claim and enjoy the compleat Exercise of their Religion in their own respective Forms together with the full Power of providing a Succession of Ministers among themselves, the Church of England is unhappily distinguished by the Want of that Indulgence and put under Difficulties which threaten even it's Existence. The members of this Communion can resort for the Ordination of their Ministers only to England or Ireland; and from the ancient Rite of Confirmation they are totally debarred; as these are Acts peculiar to the Episcopal Order, and transferable to no other. A Popish Bishop is indeed allowed, but to him they cannot apply to ordain their Ministers or to confirm their Children.

¹ Colonial Office Records: "America and West Indies," Bundle 681.

We therefore most humbly and earnestly implore your Majesty to take into consideration the weak and imperfect Condition of the Church of England in America, and to give the Members of its Communion the means of the compleat Exercise of our holy Religion and the full Enjoyment of their Ecclesiastical Constitution, by sending thither a Bishop duly consecrated and appointed by Commission from your Majesty the supreme head of the Church and Fountain of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

This our humble Representation we think it our bounden Duty to offer to your Majesty, more especially at this time, not only in consequence of the Wishes and Expectations of your Majesty's faithful Subjects of the Church of England in those parts, but also because the erection of new Parishes, the Assignment of Stations to the Clergy, driven from their native Provinces on Account of their Attachment to the British Constitution, and a variety of other Circumstances strongly call for an Ecclesiastical Superior whose Authority and Influence may be of the greatest Use in the due Government and Direction of the Clergy. These Points therefore, of the highest Concern to your Majesty's Subjects of the Church of England in your American Dominions We Submit with all Humility to your Royal Consideration, beseeching your Majesty to take such Order therein as to your Wisdom shall seem fit, and the great Importance of them may require.

[Endorsed]

Representation of the
Archbishop of Canter-
bury and the Bishop of
London.

State of the Church in America.

J. CANTUAR.
R. LONDON.

3. *Lincoln's Nomination to Congress, 1846.*

The late Judge N. J. Rockwell, of Mason County, Illinois, was for many years a friend of Abraham Lincoln. The following letter — one, doubtless, of many such — was sent to him in 1846 when Lincoln was making an active canvass for the nomination to Congress. In the following month General Hardin withdrew, and Lincoln was duly nominated and elected. The defeated Democratic candidate was the famous Rev. Peter Cartwright.

Judge Rockwell was a staunch Whig and one of the original Republicans of Illinois. His sterling integrity is illustrated by the fact that having been declared elected to the state Senate he declined to take the seat, on the ground that a sufficient number of votes to elect his opponent had been thrown out by the canvassers on a mere technicality. The Judge spent his last years in Troy, N.Y.; after his death the letter herewith printed was found among his papers by his nephew, Mr. George B. Cluett.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

LINCOLN TO N. J. ROCKWELL.

SPRINGFIELD, Jany. 21, 1846.

MR. N. J. ROCKWELL

Dear Sir :

You, perhaps, know that Gen' HARRIS and I have a contest for the Whig nomination for Congress in this District. He has had a turn; and my argument is that "Turn about is fair play." I shall be pleased if this strikes you as a sufficient argument.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

4. *Letter of John C. Calhoun, 1847.**To the Editor of the American Historical Review :*

The enclosed letter from Mr. Calhoun to Hon. Waddy Thompson of South Carolina may be of interest to some of your readers. While the letter contains perhaps little that is new, it emphasizes in a striking manner the fearless independence of thought and action that renders the character of this eminent man so unique in our history.

LYON G. TYLER.

JOHN C. CALHOUN TO WADDY THOMPSON.¹FORT HILL, 29th Octr 1847.*Dear Sir,*

I have read your letter with attention, and will answer it in the same spirit of candour and freedom, with which it is written.

We do not disagree, as to the cause of the war, nor as to its certain disastrous consequences in the end, let it terminate as it will. We al[s]o agree in the opinion, that the war ought to terminate, and that my position requires me to use my best efforts to bring it to an end. But the great practical question is; How can that be done?

In deciding that question, it must not be overlooked, that both parties by large majorities stand committed by their recorded votes, not only to the war, but that the war is a war of aggression on the part of the Republick of Mexico, aggression by invasion and spilling American blood on American soil, and thus committed also to the Rio Grande being the Western boundary of the state of Texas. It is true, that very few of either party believed, that there was any just cause of war, or that the Rio Grande was the Western boundary of Texas, or that the Republick of Mexico had made war on us by the invasion of our territory, or any other way; but it is equally true, that by an act of unexampled weakness, to use the mildest terms, both stand by admission on record to the very opposite of their belief. And what is

¹ MS. in private possession.

worse, they have by this act of unpar[all]elled weakness, committed large portions of both parties out of Congress to the war, as just and unavoidable on our part.

The effect of all this, with brilliant achievements of our arms, have been greatly to weaken the opposition and to strengthen the party in power, and to make it impossible, in my opinion, to terminate the war in the manner you propose. I go further, to attempt it, would only tend, under circumstances, to weaken those, who make it, and give a new impulse to what is called the vigorous prosecution of the war, instead of bringing it to a termination. I thought so at the last session, and so informed Mr. Berrien and the other Whig members, when he presented his amendment, and such in my opinion has been the effect, and will continue to be its effect, if it should be renewed at the next session. The course I adopted then, or rather suggested, was the only one that had the least prospect of bring[ing] the war to an end. I stood prepared to carry it out, if I had been supported; and, if I had been, the carnage and expenses of this campaign, would have been avoided. I shall take my seat prepared to do all in my power to bring it to an end, consistently with the state of things, in which I may find the country; but I fear with as little support, as I had in opposition to the war, or in my attempt to terminate it, at the last session. The fatal error of the Whigs, in voting for the war, has rendered them impotent, as a party, in opposition to it; and let me add, that while I agree with them in the policy of preserving the peace of the country, as long as it can be consistently with honor, I fear their timidity, as a party, on all questions, including peace and war, is so great, as to render their policy of preserving peace of little avail. It is not only in this instance, that it has disclosed itself. Even on the Oregon question, they gave away, before my arrival at Washington, on Cass's resolution, and rendered it very difficult to re[co]ver what was then lost. To go farther back; they made but feeble efforts to preserve peace during Jackson and Van Buren's time on the Maine boundary question, and permitted me to stand alone in open opposition to Genl^l Jackson's course, in reference to the French indemnity, backed by the report of the Committee of Foreign relations in the Senate, which, had it not been for the mediation of England, would have ended in War. I rose in my place in the Senate, after the report was read, and exposed and denounced the whole affair, without a voice raised in my support. It is this timidity, when they are right, in questions connected with our foreign relations, and their errors, in reference to those appertaining to our domestick relations, which keeps them out of power, notwithstanding their individual respectability, and prevents them from performing, with effect, the important duties of an opposition. I am sure you will excuse this free expression of my opinion, in relation to a party, with which you rank yourself.

With great respect

I am &c.

J. C. CALHOUN.

HON. W. THOMPSON.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

La Enseñanza de la Historia. Por RAFAEL ALTAMIRA, Secretario del Museo Pedagógico Nacional, etc. (Madrid: Librería de Victoriano Suárez. 1895. Pp. xii, 457.)

ALTHOUGH nominally a second edition, this is really a new work; for the first edition, printed in 1891, was not put on sale generally, but was privately circulated. In its preparation Mr. Altamira has evidently had two objects in view, the improvement of historical teaching in Spain, and the advancement of intelligent historical study. After a brief declaration of his pedagogical principles, he takes a rapid survey of the present condition of historical teaching in Europe and the United States. This sketch is interesting and seems to be based on both personal experience and a careful examination of a mass of recent literature.

The proper scope of history is the subject of the third chapter, and it is discussed, first historically, and then in the light of contemporary opinion. Starting from the classical idea of history as the narrative of the political life of states, Altamira traces the gradual broadening of this conception under the influence of the continual increase of knowledge and the expansion of human interests. Only glimpses of the truth that history is more than past politics can be found before the eighteenth century. In that century the first great representative of the newer conception was Voltaire, but it was also advanced with great distinctness in Spain. Sarmiento in 1775 declared that history should give an account not only of military events but of the physical, geographical, political, moral, theological, and literary phenomena of the national life. Jovellanos (1778) asserted that history should unfold the origin and development of the national constitution, of the civil and political hierarchy, of legislation and customs, of the national glory and the national poverty. Masdeu and Capmany a little later produced brilliant examples of the new history. Yet among all the writers of the eighteenth century Altamira selects Volney as representing the fullest development of these ideas. In 1794, as professor of history in the newly founded École Normale, Volney drew up a programme of history. In it he discussed the certainty of history, its importance, its utility as a study, and other pedagogical questions. This was followed by a proposal of a summary of general history to comprise the progress of the arts, the sciences, public and private morals, and the ideas in regard to them, legislation, emigration, mixture

of races, influence of physical environment, etc.¹ How many of the greatest names in the succeeding century were to be identified with the carrying out of this programme! Volney, however, still attached primary importance to political history. The following has a very familiar and modern sound. "I confess that, in my view, the political utility of history is its sole and proper end: private morals, the advance of the sciences and arts appear to me to be only episodes and accidents; the chief object, the fundamental art, is the application of history to government, to legislation, to the whole economy of societies. So that I should be ready to style history the physiology of states."² This is substantially the doctrine of Seeley. In the second part of this chapter Altamira insists that history should embrace the whole life of humanity. The fifth chapter is taken up with a survey of modern views as to the influence of Nature on history, and as to the proper subject of history, whether the state or the people. The classification of the material to be studied, its proper use and the criticism of it, and a list of printed sources, occupy three chapters of more than ordinary interest and helpfulness. The student will find in them not a few suggestions and bibliographical references in addition to those contained in Bernheim's *Lehrbuch*. The rest of the volume is purely pedagogical and treats of the use of text-books, secondary instruction, and the teaching of history in Spain.

The essence of Altamira's views on the proper method of teaching can be expressed in a few sentences. Such a summary, however, does little justice to the vigor and success with which he expounds them. Lectures and recitations alone are quite inadequate for imparting the mental discipline and practical training to be derived from the study of history. In all but the most elementary instruction there should be some work on the sources of history. The use of text-books and lectures alone burdens the memory and spares the reasoning faculties, implants a wrong idea of the nature of historical study and an excessive reverence for second- and third-hand authorities. "Students are left to receive and assimilate dogmatic results like a mysterious drug without examination." Consequently they come to believe that the larger part of history is uncontestedly authenticated or settled, and that there is little or no further need of investigation. The true text-books should be a collection of documents and works of reference to be used not instead of the sources, but as a guide to the study of them. "The true aim of historical study is the formation of the personality of the pupil, the awakening of his native faculties, especially the critical spirit, and of absolute respect for the truth and the real, caution in judgment and in generalization, and the renunciation of every supposition not authorized by the facts." To

¹ From *Séances des Écoles Normales*, recueillies par des sténographes et revues par les professeurs; édition of 1800, Vol. I., pp. 78, 79; Vol. III., pp. 411-415.

² *Séances*, Vol. II., p. 441. I give these references from Altamira and this space to Volney, because Flint, in his elaborate *History of the Philosophy of History in France*, gives only a very inadequate account of Volney, based on his well-known *Ruins*.

develop these characteristics the pupil must study primarily the objects themselves, and not descriptions of them or opinions about them.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

Julian, Philosopher and Emperor, and the Last Struggle of Paganism against Christianity. By ALICE GARDNER, Lecturer and Associate of Newnham College, Cambridge. (London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1895. Pp. xx, 364.)

OF blind partisans and bitter detractors the Emperor Julian has had enough and to spare, both in ancient and modern days; of sober and impartial biographers he has had few. Among the latter Miss Gardner must be accorded high rank, for her book is a model of fairness and frankness. Its most conspicuous merit, in fact, is its complete freedom from partisan bias and the just discrimination with which it portrays the character and the conduct not of Julian alone but of his contemporaries as well, whether friends or foes. Even Constantius is generously handled and his attitude toward Julian and his relations with him are set in a true light. It is difficult to write about a character and a career like Julian's—so widely misunderstood, so persistently misinterpreted—without heat and passion, but Miss Gardner has succeeded admirably in maintaining her poise and in preserving that judicial frame of mind which distinguishes the historian from the special pleader. Indeed, if her book errs at all it is in the direction of excessive coolness. The enthusiasm for the subject of her sketch, to which she confesses in her preface, we might almost wish had been allowed a little fuller play and had been a little less rigorously held in check.

The story of Julian's life is told with admirable clearness and simplicity and with an excellent sense of proportion. A brief sketch of the condition of the Roman world under Constantine introduces the reader to the environment in which Julian was born and bred, and serves to elucidate much in his career that must otherwise remain inexplicable. The account of the experiences of his boyhood, and the very interesting description of his early education and of his university life which follow, shed still clearer light upon the subject; for of few great men has it been truer than of Julian that "the boy is father of the man." The chapters upon his religion and philosophy, upon his work as a religious reformer, and upon his policy against the Christians are particularly good and display keen insight and sharp discrimination. The account of Julian's Cæsarship in Gaul is less satisfactory. Not enough of his achievements is told to justify the high encomium pronounced upon him and no attempt is made to analyze his military genius and to explain his remarkable successes. This is the more to be regretted because, though his natural tastes and his early training were anything but military, his imperial ideals and his plans for their realization can be understood only in the light of the fact that he was a successful and popular commander before he became

an emperor and that he owed his crown to his army. There are some other parts of the book where one cannot help wishing that the author had been more thoroughgoing and had grappled a little more earnestly with some of the difficult problems presented by Julian's unique and many-sided personality, but even more serious defects than this any one would gladly overlook in a book containing the characterization of Julian with which Miss Gardner closes her remarks upon his place in history. We know of nothing finer and more discriminating than the following estimate of him:—

"If we look at him impartially and yet with the sympathetic understanding that we can only obtain after trying in imagination to realize his point of view, we see in him not a genius of the first rank in statesmanship, strategy, literature or religious philosophy; not a character unequalled in virtue and strength, but a man who did something because of his earnest devotion to his ideals and who would have done more if he had been gifted with a surer insight and had moved at a less feverish pace. He was a good king and a strong warrior, as his epitaph says. Yet his conduct at Antioch showed him unable to meet all the requirements of a disordered state, and his neglect of precautions, especially in the Persian war, prevents us from ranking him among the great generals of the world. He wrote in what for his age may be regarded as a pure style, but he wrote too rapidly to produce any great work. He was a thinker and often throws a ray of light on matters obscured by convention and prejudice, but his mind was not calm and collected enough for us to rank him among great philosophers. His personal character is most attractive. He had warm affections, a strong desire to do justice, and an abiding sense of moral responsibility." . . . "Yet with all his love of truth and goodness there were some potent types which he was quite incapable of recognizing. With all his desire for equity he could not always be fair to those whom he could not understand. In spite of his realization of the littleness of human effort in the universal system of nature and man, he could not see how powerless were his own endeavors to oppose a barrier to the incoming tide.

"Yet Julian was one to whom much may be forgiven because he loved much. If turning aside from the account of his short and chequered career we look to the main principle by which he was throughout guided we see that it was an entire devotion to the Greek idea of thought and life, a settled determination to prevent as far as in him lay the destruction, by what he regarded as barbarous and degraded forces, of that fair fabric of ancient civilization under which men had learned to venerate beauty and order, to aim at a reasonable, well-contained life, and to live in orderly society under intelligible laws and humane institutions."

A. C. MCGIFFERT.

An Advanced History of England. By CYRIL RANSOME. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. xviii, 1069.)

A History of England. By CHARLES OMAN. (London: Edward Arnold. 1895. Pp. iv, 760.)

THE publication in rapid succession of two histories of England, both written by experienced teachers of history, testifies to the need felt for a

compendious text-book on English history for the use of schools and colleges. Both books are designed for English students, and neither of them makes any special pretension to satisfying the needs of American teachers and students. It is exceedingly doubtful whether an English writer could possibly produce a book suitable for college use in America. This is not entirely owing to the natural difference in the point of view from which English history is regarded in the two countries, but to the fact that certain essential features in English history, as for instance the position of the Church in England, are unintelligible to American students without a far more elaborate explanation than is necessary for Englishmen who have absorbed a knowledge of ecclesiastical history from the very existence among them of parish churches and cathedrals. Professor Ransome has for many years held the post of Professor of History in the Yorkshire College at Leeds, one of the best local educational institutions in England, while Mr. Oman is well known at Oxford as one of the ablest history tutors in the university. Their experience has, therefore, been with different types of pupils, but both of them in their prefaces urge their practical knowledge of the needs of teachers and pupils in justification of their appearing as authors of somewhat lengthy and methodical histories of England. They do not cater to the general reader, whose needs are splendidly supplied by Green's *Short History of the English People*, a work not likely to be surpassed during the present generation for general purposes, though it is unfortunately ill-fitted by its very virtues for a college text-book. Both Professor Ransome and Mr. Oman have already gained considerable reputation as historical writers, the former by his excellent *Short History of England*, the latter by his *Art of War in the Middle Ages*, his *History of Europe A.D. 476-918*, and other works. Their latest productions, therefore, have been eagerly looked forward to by historical teachers and scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.

It must be said at once that Professor Ransome's book is marred by a great and essential fault. It is full of inaccuracies. However great may be the shortcomings of a text-book in other respects, they can generally be forgiven if the facts are accurately stated. But, on the other hand, however great may be the merits of a text-book in other respects, it must be condemned if inaccurate. Professor Ransome's book possesses many merits; the space given to periods and events is fairly proportioned; the judgments passed on historical characters are generally just; the accounts of military operations are excellent and illustrated by useful plans of battles; and it presents no partisan view of men or political parties. This is high praise; but every reader of Professor Ransome's little book expected these merits. What was unexpected is the inaccuracy, which makes the book practically useless for teaching purposes. It is hardly possible to look at a page without finding one or more mistakes. Turning, for instance, at random to the chapter on Henry II., the date of the Assize of Clarendon is given as 1156 instead of 1166 (p. 145), and a couple of paragraphs later the date of the Battle of Clontarf is given as

1017 instead of 1014 (p. 147). A most casual examination will show many similar instances of carelessness, as for instance the statement that Madras was founded in 1629 instead of 1639 (p. 797). The author's account of the American War of Independence is full of inaccuracies; he speaks of *Sir* John Burgoyne, though Burgoyne never was knighted; he deprives General Greene of his final *e*; and must needs offend the patriotism of inhabitants of Brooklyn by remarking that Howe withdrew his troops to Long Island, "on which Brooklyn, now a populous suburb of New York, stands" (p. 825). His remarks on Washington, contained in the following sentence, illustrate the tendency of modern English writers to glorify Washington at the expense of the other leaders in the American Revolution, and show a curiously inverted attitude of mind, which must seem strange to American students. "George Washington," he says, "was a Virginia planter and a thorough gentleman, whose simple and fearless character and transparent honesty of purpose gave dignity to the cause which he espoused and inspired respect among the democratic officers and men with whom he had to deal" (p. 825). Professor Ransome's account of the War of 1812 is equally unsatisfactory. He patriotically asserts that the American ships were successful in their duels with the English ships because they were better found, and goes on to state that "in some fights, however, where the vessels were practically on an equality, the British won" (p. 903). He attributes the success of the Americans on the Great Lakes to the superiority of their flotilla and the inferiority of the English commander, and twice miscalls Sir Edward Pakenham Sir *John* Pakenham (p. 904). Whenever Professor Ransome touches on American affairs he makes mistakes; his treatment of the American Civil War is exceedingly faulty. Comment upon the following sentences is needless. "In the end," he says, "the Northerners defeated the Southerners owing to their greater numbers, their greater wealth, and their ability to establish a navy, which gave them command of the sea, which enabled them to paralyse the commerce of the Southerners and to use the seacoast as a basis for military operations, — advantages of which full use was made by the dogged determination of President Lincoln and the military skill of General Grant. During the war the slaves of the Southern States were declared by the *Federal Congress* to be free, and since then the negroes of the United States have had in law the same rights as their fellow-citizens" (p. 1000).

Mr. Oman's book is written on much the same scale as Professor Ransome's, but is perhaps a little more "modern" in form and treatment. It is clearly to be perceived in studying its pages that the author belongs to a later generation of historians than Professor Ransome, and that he is in closer touch with modern historical ideas as developed in Oxford. His book does not offend by the innumerable inaccuracies which mar the merits of its rival, but on the other hand its literary style, in the endeavor to be bright and interesting, compares badly with the sobriety of Professor Ransome's language. Occasionally a certain archaic pedantry in the use

of words is to be observed in the earlier chapters, and a protest must be entered against using, in a book intended for the use of college students, such an adjective as "autolatrous," which is applied on page 574 to Louis XIV. It may perhaps be interesting to compare Mr. Oman's treatment of the American War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the American Civil War with Professor Ransome's attitude on these subjects. Mr. Oman, too, ignores all the heroes of the American Revolution except Washington, and illustrates the English tendency, already alluded to, of exaggerating the rôle of Washington and ignoring or depreciating the work of other leaders. "George Washington," he writes, "was a Virginian planter, who had seen much service in the last French War, and was almost the only colonist who possessed a good military reputation. No choice could have been better; Washington was a staid, upright, energetic man, very different from the windy demagogues who led the rebellion in most of the colonies" (p. 546). It would take too long to examine further Mr. Oman's account of the American War of Independence, but it seems, on the whole, more adequate than Professor Ransome's, although perhaps excessively condensed. With regard to the War of 1812, Mr. Oman, like Professor Ransome, apologizes for the defeats suffered by the English ships in naval duels in the following words: "The fact was that individually the American ships were larger and carried heavier guns than our own, so that the first defeats were no matter of shame to our navy" (p. 627). The military operations are described in half a dozen sentences in which Mr. Oman speaks of Sir George Prevost as "imbecile," and of Sir Edward Pakenham as "over-bold." With regard to his treatment of the Civil War, Mr. Oman is biassed by his passionate admiration for Lord Palmerston, whom he terms "the most striking personage in the middle years of the century" and the statesman who "won and merited the confidence of the nation more than any minister since the younger Pitt" (p. 699). Mr. Oman makes no attempt to describe the events of the Civil War itself, and therefore does not give himself the opportunity of going wrong to the same extent as Professor Ransome. He devotes himself rather to explaining according to his lights how English opinion was divided upon the subject, and to giving high praise to Palmerston, who, according to his theory, tried to steer a middle course, and was not, as ninety-nine out of a hundred people have always held, the mainstay of the Southern sympathizers in England. "It was urged," says Mr. Oman, "that the North were fighting for the cause of liberty against slavery; and this idea affected many earnest-minded men, to the exclusion of any other consideration. On the other side it was urged that the Southern States were exercising an undoubted constitutional right in severing themselves from the Union, and this was true enough in itself. It was certain that the Southerners, who wished for Free Trade, were likely to be better friends of England than the protectionist North, which had always shown a bitter jealousy of English commerce. Many men were moved by the rather unworthy consideration that America was growing so strong and populous

that she might one day become 'the bully of the world,' and welcomed a convulsion that threatened to split the Union into two hostile halves. Others illogically sympathized with the South merely because it was the weaker side, or because they thought the Southern planters better men than the hard and astute traders of the North. The Palmerston Cabinet, with great wisdom, tried to steer a middle course and to avoid all interference. But when the Confederates held their own in arms, they thought themselves bound to recognize them as a belligerent power and to treat them as a nation" (p. 696). Comment upon this passage, with its curious travesty of Palmerston's position, is needless.

It is to be stated in conclusion that both these new histories of England are strong upon the military side and that they are both illustrated with several plans of famous battles. The distinguished authors have produced books which will hardly increase their reputation as historians, but which are nevertheless gallant attempts to meet the want which undoubtedly exists for a competent and scholarly history of England for the use of high schools and colleges.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

Feudal England: Historical Studies on the XIth and XIIth Centuries. By J. H. ROUND, M.A. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1895. Pp. xvi, 587.)

MOST of the papers in this volume have appeared in recent years in the *English Historical Review* and other periodicals; they have been carefully revised, and much new matter has been added. This series of studies, covering the years 1050-1200, is called *Feudal England*, because some of them deal with the origins or early history of the feudal system. A title referring to Domesday Book would, perhaps, be more appropriate, for in the most important essays Domesday Book is carefully exploited; and the most valuable results of Mr. Round's researches are largely based on that great record or on kindred surveys. This volume will, in fact, give him a high rank among Domesday investigators; in his profound knowledge of its formulas and contents he stands without a peer. In *Feudal England*, as in *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, he displays consummate skill in the critical study of records, and uses the evidence thus obtained to check and supplement the chroniclers.

Mr. Round's minute investigations do not yield a mere mass of curious information; some of his deductions are of far-reaching importance. The most instructive papers are those on "Domesday Book" (pp. 3-146) and "The Introduction of Knight Service into England" (pp. 225-314). The second half of the volume is largely devoted to the errors of Professor Freeman, who is accused of viewing plain facts "through a mist of moots and witan" and of sinning against all the canons of historical learning. As regards the famous controversy concerning the palisade at the Battle of Hastings, no one, it seems, has ever called attention to the fact

that Mr. Round's criticism of Professor Freeman's views was anticipated, to a certain extent at least, by G. Koehler in his *Entwicklung des Kriegswesens* (1886), with which work Mr. Round does not seem to be acquainted.

Many of Mr. Round's new conclusions are derived from a careful comparison of Domesday Book with the "Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis," which is a copy of the original returns of the Domesday jurors and deals with the holders of lands in Cambridgeshire. He confirms the view that the hide, when used as a measure of area in Domesday, contains 120 acres; and he propounds the new theory that the assessment of land in Domesday is based on the five-hide unit among the Anglo-Saxons in the South, and on the six-carucate unit among the Danes in the North. Most of the southern manors are assessed in Domesday as of five hides or some multiple of five hides, and our author holds that this assessment bore no ratio to area or to value in the vill or the manor; in other words, the hide, in this system of taxation, was not an areal measure but a term of assessment. The territorial hundred, as a whole, was assessed for some multiple of the five-hide unit, and the representatives of the hundred saw that each vill or manor was debited with a correct share of the liability. The part played in the hidated portions of England by the five-hide unit is played in the Danish districts by a unit of six carucates. This rule applies not to the Danelaw, not to "the district which the Danes *conquered*, but the district which the Danes *settled*, the district of 'the Five Boroughs'" (p. 71). Mr. Round's statement regarding this matter is somewhat misleading, for he also includes Yorkshire in the carucated district, and Yorkshire was not dependent on "the Five Boroughs."

The method adopted by the Witan to apportion the Danegeld is explained as follows:—

"Their only possible resource, we might hold, would be to apportion it in round sums among the contributory shires. Proceeding on precisely the same lines, the county court, in its turn, would distribute the *quota* of the shire among its constituent Hundreds, and the Hundred court would then assign to each Vill its share. As the Villages were represented in the Hundred court, and the Hundreds in the Shire court, the just apportionment of the Shire's *quota* would be thus practically secured" (p. 92).

The assertion that the villages were represented in the hundred court and the hundreds in the shire court, though it may be true, is too categorical; the evidence on which this statement is commonly based is certainly very meagre. Moreover, in dealing with the same general subject (p. 97), Mr. Round, like most writers, accepts Bishop Stubbs' dictum that the territorial hundred is first mentioned in England in Edgar's laws; it is, however, clearly mentioned in Edmund's laws, III. c. 2.

Among other matters discussed in connection with Domesday Book, those of special interest are the composition of the juries by whom the returns were made, the origin of the "Inquisitio Eliensis," and the striking differences between the two volumes formed from the Domesday

returns. Mr. Round sees no proof that Domesday Book was compiled in 1086; because the survey was made in 1086, it has been hastily concluded that Domesday Book was completed in that year. He often points out errors in this peerless record; it is not to him the sacrosanct repository of facts that it was to Pepys, who wrote to a friend for information as to what it contained "concerning the sea and the dominion thereof." He also calls attention to the unsound methods employed by modern investigators in studying that great record.

In the essay on knight service our author takes a firm stand against what he calls "the anticataclysmic tendencies of modern thought," or "the theory of gradual development and growth." He rejects the view that military tenures and the feudal system were introduced into England during the reign of William Rufus through the influence of Ranulf Flambard. He believes that just as Henry II. granted out the provinces of Ireland to be held as fiefs by the service of a round number of knights, so William the Conqueror granted out the fiefs he formed in England, and that these fiefs were wholly new creations constructed from the scattered fragments of Anglo-Saxon estates. Thus the Conqueror divided England into military fees and systematically introduced feudal tenures into England. The quotas of knight service were not estimated on the basis of the number of five-hide units contained in the fief, but were determined arbitrarily by the king. The number of differing fiefs assessed at precisely the same amount of knight service proves that the assessment was wholly arbitrary. The knight's fee, held by an undertenant, consisted normally of an estate worth £20 a year, and was not based on the five hides of the Anglo-Saxon system. The whole number of knights' fees for which service was due to the crown did not exceed five thousand.

In dealing with knight service, our author throws much light on the early history of scutage; he proves that it existed at least as early as Henry I.'s reign, and that the amount of scutage was determined by the estimated cost of substitutes hired to perform the vassal's military service. "Thus the only change involved [by the introduction of scutage] would be that the tenant would make his payments not to substitutes, but to the crown." Mr. Round seems to underestimate the importance of this change; for the very essence of scutage is that it is a payment made directly to the king which enables him to dispense with the tenant's military service. Moreover, on pages 270-273, our author seemingly believes that scutage was a necessary corollary of all military tenures from the outset, but on page 533 he states that, when scutage first appears, it is peculiar to church fiefs.

In more than one place in this volume, the conviction is expressed that the Norman Conquest marks a distinct break or starting-point in English history, "that our consecutive political history does, in a sense, begin with the Norman Conquest," and that "the feudal element introduced at the Conquest had a greater influence on our national institutions than recent historians admit." It is interesting to notice the trend of

recent research backward toward the adoption of the "antiquated" views of writers like Selden and Spelman. We see this trend in Pike's *House of Lords*, in Vinogradoff's *Folkland*, and, in a marked degree, in Round's *Feudal England*. There can be little doubt that Freeman unduly exalted the English element and minimized the results of the Norman Conquest. The present drift of investigation seems to be in the right direction, even if it is toward "antiquated" ideas.

CHARLES GROSS.

England under the Tudors. Vol. I. King Henry VII. (1485-1509).

By DR. WILHELM BUSCH, Professor of Modern History at the University of Freiburg in Baden. Translated under the supervision of the Rev. A. H. Johnson, M. A., by Alice M. Todd. With an Introduction and some Comments by James Gairdner. (London: A. D. Innes and Co. 1895. Pp. xiv, 445.)

THE various prefaces, introductions, and appendices make Professor Busch's work largely self-explanatory as to its sources, objects, and ideals. This volume is the first of six which are intended to cover the whole of the Tudor period, the first two volumes being devoted to the creation of the absolute monarchy by Henry VII. and Wolsey, the second two to the struggle of Henry VIII. with the Catholic Church and the immediate results of this quarrel, and the third section to the reign of Elizabeth. The work is distinctly a contribution to English history, in that it is based entirely upon a study of contemporary sources. From these the author constructs a picture of Henry VII. which is very different from that which has been most familiar. His avaricious tendencies, which play so large a part in older explanations of his policy, fall into insignificance. The cool calculations of the politician, patiently working out the problems prescribed by his difficult circumstances, rise into corresponding prominence.

The basis of Henry's policy is to be found in the effort, in the first place, to make good his position on the throne, and secondly, to elevate this royal power into a really absolute monarchy. To the first object tended all his complicated foreign relations. The pressure upon continental sovereigns to abstain from the support of pretenders to the English throne, the marriages and marriage treaties by which he obtained recognition among the older and more firmly seated dynasties, the strenuous efforts to maintain peace, so that his finances and internal administration might remain strong and regular, were all directed toward his security on a throne the right to which was, after all, but that of conquest. When this end was attained, his ambition for English prominence in European affairs was satisfied. Even Ireland was, with this view, treated in a strictly opportunist fashion, though part of his policy there was necessarily more creative. His moderate and prudent internal administration was instigated by the same necessity for guarding against deposition in the interest of some pretender, or as the outcome of a renewed civil war. In other internal affairs, how-

ever, a second and more ambitious ideal guided the king. Financial considerations of course often took the first place, as was necessary in the chaotic condition of the treasury and the national impatience of taxation. But commerce, the budding manufactures, the incipient agrarian revolution, judicial organization and practice, his relations with the church and with the nobles, all were treated with the deliberate object of creating an "enlightened despotism." This policy of extension of royal power naturally culminated in the relations between the king and the three Estates of Parliament. With Parliament as such he seems to have had almost no friction. Even the possibility of friction was reduced to its lowest proportions by the infrequent summons of Parliament, but one meeting having occurred during the last twelve years of his reign. A number of important statutes were passed which were in the main dictated by the king's policy, but they seem to have roused no opposition. With the Estates separately there was more danger of contest. Yet Henry succeeded in keeping on good terms with the Church, patronizing the reformers of his time, nominating the bishops and then drawing from their ranks his most trusted ministers. The nobles were reduced to political insignificance, partly by direct means, such as the reorganization of the Council, with respect to its judicial functions, into the Court of Star Chamber, partly by undermining their influence through putting the active work of government into the hands of untitled men and churchmen who were of his own creation. It is suggested rather than asserted that to one of these untitled counsellors, Archbishop Morton, Henry owed most of the statesmanship of his reign.

Dr. Busch's use of the sources is critical, scholarly, and excellent altogether. References are given for all statements, without exception; the sources to be found in England, both printed and manuscript, have been examined with the greatest care, and many continental collections have been utilized which were previously almost unknown to English writers. A most valuable feature of the book is the full description and criticism of the work of the contemporary chroniclers, given in an appendix. An ingenious and carefully worked out demonstration of the former existence and of the authorship of a chronicle now lost is equalled in interest and value by a destructive criticism of Bacon's *History of Henry VII.* This work was written near enough to the period of its subject to obtain a false seeming of being contemporary information, and yet, as is here shown, had no source of knowledge which is not still available to us, and was, moreover, written in an extremely uncritical and careless spirit. Nothing but praise can be given for all this critical apparatus, and for its use in solving the problems of the foreign relations of the king, and of certain other political questions. Henry's tortuous policy in his relations with Ferdinand, with Maximilian, with Philip of Burgundy, with France, Brittany, Scotland, and the Pope, is traced out with the greatest care, ingenuity, and diligence. The objects, also, of much of Henry's internal policy are skilfully generalized, as we have seen, into a deliberate attempt to restore and magnify the English monarchy.

We now come to two fundamental criticisms of Professor Busch's work. He ascribes everything to Henry and his ministers, comparatively little to the times and their characteristics and necessities. Closely connected with this is his omission, or relegation to an obscure treatment, of almost all subjects except foreign affairs and the personal policy of the king. He makes his history of the time a biography of one man, leaving us to the inference that all that history was the creation of the one individual. His own words are, "Thus from the crown came that new life which throbbed throughout England after many years of disorder" (p. 292). Judging from this first volume, the title of the work is something of a misnomer. It is not a history of England under the Tudors, but rather a history of the Tudors reigning in England. Yet the close of the fifteenth century, and the early years of the sixteenth, was a time of peculiar significance quite apart from the character and policy of Henry VII. The fact that much of his legislation was merely a renewal of statutes passed under Edward IV., which is mentioned quite casually by the author, shows that there was a great difference in the times, which allowed the same measures to succeed now which had been ineffective in the earlier reign. Henry's success in rendering the old nobility of so little weight in the government arose far more from changes which had occurred in the numbers, wealth, and social position of the aristocracy, and from the needs of foreign intercourse, than it did from his policy or his efforts. The times almost necessitated the substitution of men of talent in the ministry for men of birth. The Wars of the Roses had depleted the great families, the foreign complications were greater, and demanded a degree of capability which chance alone could provide among the small numbers of the English nobility. Foreign governments were being carried on with greater ability and diplomatic skill, and England, being compelled to meet them on their own ground, had to look for men who had the necessary ability, not merely, as of old, high rank. The same requirement arose from the increasing complexity of the royal internal government. The extension of commerce, also, and of manufactures was far more due to the increase of capital and of enterprise among the people themselves than to the manipulation of the king. Movements of all sorts were in progress with which the king had nothing to do and of which, probably, he had no knowledge.

With these broader movements of the time, Professor Busch concerns himself but little. In his preface he promises "to take as comprehensive and many-sided a view as possible of the development of England in the sixteenth century." Yet he gives some 250 pages to foreign and diplomatic history and to the details of the three great conspiracies, some fifty more to commerce, looked upon largely as a matter of diplomacy, and only about thirty to general internal affairs. It is true that an account of the intellectual movement of the times is designedly left to be treated in connection with a later period, but our objection is to the inadequate treatment of the non-royal and non-diplomatic objects which the author

does touch upon. There were many men whose influence was considerable and whose characters were worthy of study, besides the king and two or three of his ministers and ambassadors; there was a history of the people as well as of the king. As much interest and importance ought to be found in the internal as in the external relations of the nation; military, constitutional, economic, and intellectual matters are certainly worthy to be considered in as great fulness as are diplomatic and foreign affairs. These two characteristics — the exaggeration of the king's influence, and the cursory treatment of many aspects of the time — are, probably, responsible for a certain lack of interesting quality in the work, notwithstanding its scholarly character.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

William the Silent, Prince of Orange: The Moderate Man of the Sixteenth Century. The Story of his Life as told from his own Letters, from those of his Friends and Enemies, and from Official Documents. By RUTH PUTNAM. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1895. Two vols., pp. xxii, 366; ix, 431, 81.)

MR. MOTLEY'S brilliant and voluminous work has for so many years been considered the authority in English on the history of the Dutch Republic and its great founder, that a writer of to-day dealing with the same subject must be prepared not only to show cause why that history should be rewritten, but also to prove his own special qualifications for the task. Miss Putnam has done both. The story needs to be rewritten because new material has been made accessible to students, and because the demand of to-day is for a true not an idealized representation of the past. The author is admirably fitted for the work by reason of her sympathy with the subject, her historical instinct, a ready pen, a keen sense of humor, and her linguistic equipment. That the latter qualification must be specified, not assumed, is evident from recent attempts to write of Holland without a knowledge of the Dutch language.

A comparison with the work of Mr. Motley is inevitable, but in more than one particular the comparison is favorable to Miss Putnam. Her characters are not pigeonholed "heroes" and "villains," "angels" and "demons," but they win admiration because they preserve their human characteristics, or pity because of their ignorance and narrow-mindedness. The central figure in each of the two works is more attractive as it is presented in the later one. The loneliness and isolation of the life of William the Silent, his craving for sympathy and dependence on friendship, his domestic trials and disappointments, his long separation from home and friends, his sacrifices in the cause of Holland, the half-hearted support of friends and the bitter hatred of enemies, all this comes out in even clearer light in the work of Miss Putnam than it does in the glowing pages of Mr. Motley. The distinctness of the portrait is due to the fact that it

is drawn so largely in the letters of the Prince of Orange himself and in those of the different members of his family. It is a truer and therefore a better reproduction of the original, as a photographic reproduction of a painting is often superior to that given by an engraving. The recent biography is also distinctly superior to the earlier history in its recognition of the fact that footnotes, appendices, and bibliographical material are for the benefit of the general reader and the college student, not merely for the use of the learned few. The illustrations also indicate the advance made in methods of historical representation. The Belgian Lion (I. 78), the Belgian Lion crushed by Spain (II. 2), and the Pacification of Ghent (II. 156), all do more to illustrate clearly the popular feeling towards Spain than could be done by chapters of brilliant descriptions.

The limitations of the work are in the main those that are inherent in all biography. The interest in any individual, no matter how exalted his position, how admirable his character, and how heroic his life, always wanes in the presence of the movement or of the condition of society that he represents. The whole is greater than a part, and William the Silent, although he towers above his contemporaries in nobility of purpose, clearness of insight, and unselfish devotion to the cause whose champion he became, was less than the Netherlands. The Dutch Republic that owed its existence to him was always sluggish in planning if afterwards heroic in executing; it was shortsighted and often timid in its policy, sometimes negatively ungenerous and positively selfish towards its leaders, and as a rule quarrelsome, disaffected, and self-centred. Yet it is around Holland rather than around William the Silent that interest is focussed; the Prince of Orange passes from the stage, but interest in the struggle with Spain never ceases. The hero of the drama is Holland not William, and it is to extinguish the lights at the end of the fourth act when the story is made to close with the death of William rather than with the triumph of his country. In a similar way interest in the private life of a public character must always be subordinate to that felt in his public career. The love of the Prince of Orange for his family, especially for the impetuous Louis, the trial and vexation of spirit he suffered from Anne of Saxony, the companionship he found in Charlotte of Bourbon, all these are of general interest only as they show the influences that developed his public character. Biography is a necessary side-light of history proper, but it can never be a substitute for it.

Another limitation of the present work—a limitation that grows but partly out of the nature of the subject—is the lack of clear analysis of political affairs. The nature of the government of Holland is perplexing even to a careful student of history; it is hopelessly bewildering to the general reader. A single chapter stating clearly and in detail the political principles in accordance with which the different States of the Netherlands were governed, and the relation of the States to Philip II. and to the governor-general of the Provinces, would have done much to lessen the vagueness on these points that is found in the biography. It is true that

the vagueness arises in part from the very nature of political conditions in Holland; powers were everywhere ill-defined, and thus some officials usurped powers and others neglected duties, but this makes only the more necessary a distinct and careful description of the government. The life of the Prince of Orange is drawn with a firm hand, but the political background is confused and unsatisfactory.

The biography as a whole is a valuable contribution to the history of a country too little studied by American scholars.

It is unfortunate that a work so charmingly written should be disfigured by the constant use of the cleft infinitive, the invariable misplacement of the word "only," the occasional use of a singular subject with a plural verb, crude phrases such as "different — than," and a sentence like this: "The pistol was picked up and it was discovered that it had blown off Jaureguy's — such proved to be the name of the villain — thumb in the discharge" (II. 339). *Han* (I. 90, 91) is evidently a misprint for *Ham*. History has given the honorable title of "The Great Elector" to Frederick William of Brandenburg, not to Maurice of Saxony (II. 428). The genealogical tables (I. 7; II. 433) are crowded as regards form, and therefore leave much to be desired. The work has but two maps, and both are unsatisfactory; the map of the Netherlands (II. 20) is confused in coloring, while the map of the United Provinces fails to indicate what the seven provinces were. Other maps are needed, showing the location of Orange and the Nassau estates, as well as the territory affected by the various political unions formed. A copy of the famous painting of Miereveld in the royal museum at Amsterdam would have supplemented well the description of it given in the appendix, and would have been a valuable addition to the many admirable illustrations of the work.

LUCY M. SALMON.

Gustavus Adolphus: A History of the Art of War from its Revival after the Middle Ages to the End of the Spanish Succession War, with a detailed Account of the most famous Campaigns of Turenne, Condé, Eugene, and Marlborough. By THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel United States Army, retired list. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1895. Pp. xxiii, 864.)

EVERY one interested in the study of the art of war is beholden to Colonel Dodge for the work that he is doing in setting forth the origin and development of that art in the form of a series of volumes devoted to the lives and achievements of its greatest masters. His work has a value which the separate appreciation of its component volumes would hardly represent. It is the first attempt to produce a convenient means of studying the art of war in the manner recommended by Napoleon, that of reading and rereading the campaigns of the world's great captains. The author takes from among the heroes of military history six epoch-

making representatives, three of whom belong to antiquity and three to modern times: Alexander, Hannibal, Cæsar, Gustavus Adolphus, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon. Grouping about each one his principal contemporaries and such minor predecessors and successors as connect him with his dead and unborn peers, he devotes a separate volume to setting before the reader the several characters of each group in the light of the principal events of their careers.

Like the other volumes of the series, the one before us is dedicated to "The American Soldier," and must be regarded as addressed, and especially suited, to the military reader, by which is meant any one, be he soldier or civilian, who reads for military information. If the object of the reader is political information, he had better look for it in such works as Gindely's and Gardiner's *Thirty Years' War*, and the lives of Gustavus Adolphus by Leslie in English, by Parieu in French, and by Droysen in German. If it is romantic or blood-stirring sensation, he will find it in Schiller's brilliant but untrustworthy history of the Thirty Years' War. Colonel Dodge's book is a comprehensive history of the principal military changes and events which took place in Europe in consequence of the invention of printing, the introduction of gunpowder, and the Reformation. It comprises, beside the campaigns of the great Swede, and of his famous opponents Wallenstein and Tilly, those of Cromwell, Turenne, Condé, Marlborough, Prince Eugene, Charles XII., and other great generals. The author's analyses of characters and summing up of records will be read with special interest and will generally, we believe, be approved. In placing Prince Eugene above Marlborough he but confirms the judgment of the most competent critics. The reader will find in the campaigns of Gustavus the earliest military operations conducted from a regular base, and in the counter-offensive of Wallenstein, culminating in the battle of Lützen, the first grand attempt against an enemy's communications, one in which the offensive, operating as Hood did in Sherman's rear, independently of a base, compelled the opposing army to fall back and fight its own Nashville. In the campaigns of Turenne he will see the wary feints and thrusts characterizing the earliest contests in which both opponents had communications to guard; and then, if he will turn to the chapter on Charles XII., he may behold a descendant of Gustavus, the originator of methodical warfare, plunging with a feeble army into the heart of an enemy's country, in apparent ignorance or disregard of any such thing as a base or line of communication.

The success of every great soldier has been due more or less to his originating some method or implement of war, of which for a time he had a monopoly. This is pre-eminently the case with Gustavus Adolphus. Among the innovations which he is said to have originated or suggested are the paper cartridge, the cartridge-box, the bayonet, light artillery, fixed ammunition for artillery, or the artillery cartridge, the modern tactical unit, or the battalion, and the brigade. He laid the foundations of

modern military discipline, and was the first to provide an army with surgeons and chaplains. There is no other man whose name is associated with as many military improvements. Perhaps the one which is destined to endure the longest is that of the line of communication. Prior to his time armies had depots and magazines which might have been regarded as bases of operation, but in order to get supplies from them it was necessary to go to them, very much as a modern war vessel goes to a coaling station, or at the best to send to them. There was no regular system for forwarding supplies from them. Gustavus first showed the practicability of such a thing, and in so doing illustrated for the first time the importance of what is now known as Military Geography.

The author begins by briefly sketching the military history of the Middle Ages, and then describes the armament, organization, and tactics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Here the reader will perhaps be disappointed by the lack of information as to certain details, as to where Gustavus Adolphus devised or invented, and where he simply adopted and introduced, and as to the extent to which his innovations in the Swedish army were copied or anticipated in the armies with which he contended. The reader will learn that about 1626 he introduced the wheel-lock into his army, and may therefrom draw the erroneous conclusion that the wheel-lock was in general use in the Swedish army during the subsequent wars of Gustavus. He is left in the dark as to whether the Germans or Poles had wheel-locks, and is given no adequate idea of what a wheel-lock is or in what respects and to what extent it had the advantage over the match-lock. He is not told the range either of the small arms or of the artillery.

Most of the book is taken up with military operations. One cannot read them without being impressed with the author's familiarity with his subject and with the soundness of his military judgments and criticisms. But the average reader will find it hard to fix his mind upon them. He will lay the book down at frequent intervals, or read but a little at a time. Colonel Dodge has a style of writing which may be characterized as free and easy, and which, it need hardly be added, lacks the conciseness essential to good military narration. He is not careful to state the military problem and the means available for solving it, before taking up the solution of it, and to give an idea of the purpose or object of a movement as he describes it. He omits political details which are properly a part of the military history of the Thirty Years' War, and essential to the lessons to be learned from it.

Gustavus Adolphus entered Germany with a field army numbering about 13,000 men, at a time when the forces under Tilly and Wallenstein numbered about 100,000. He counted on re-enforcements, which soon came to him, from home and from friendly states, but like Alexander in Asia, and Hannibal in Europe, he relied largely for recruits upon the enemy's country. The main or general idea of his successive campaigns was to arouse the disaffected elements in the German Empire and attach them

to his cause. There were two feelings or passions for him to work upon, the religious and the political; and two means of working upon them, persuasion and force. Much, if not most, of the interest of the Thirty Years' War, and of its value as a military study, lies in the political operations conducted by and with these agencies. As an exposition of the state of the art of war, the book would be more instructive if fewer campaigns were discussed, and these gone into more deeply; especially, if more attention were paid to the arrangements on Gustavus' lines of communication, which, together with his political power, would seem to be the great secret of his invincibility. The battles are very well described, the numbers, dispositions, movements, and results being clearly, and perhaps without exception correctly, set forth. Colonel Dodge asserts that at the battle of Breitenfeld the Imperialists were drawn up in a single line. "Only the Italian author Gualdo," he says, "speaks of two lines; other accounts mention no second line." On page 52 of the *Précis des Campagnes de Gustave Adolphe en Allemagne* (Bibliothèque Internationale) we find the following statement: "Most of the plans of the battle of Breitenfeld represent the Imperialists in a single line; according to Colonel Stammfort, this error—which Lossan (*Ideale der Kriegsführung*) calls an absurdity—results from the fact that these plans were made by the Swedes, who could but imperfectly observe the positions of their adversaries during the action."

As one takes up this book for the first time, and observes the numerous maps scattered through it, and the large map at the end, one thinks, or ventures to hope, that it is one of those rare gems of military bibliography, a history that can be read without the aid of an atlas. But experience soon brings one to a different state of mind. The maps in the text are mostly patches of the large map at the end of the book, and on a smaller scale than the latter. If they were on a larger scale, or showed the positions of troops or lines of march, they would serve a useful purpose. As it is, they are worse than useless, for they distract the attention of the reader from the better map. The large map does not, when unfolded, come outside of the book. A part of it cannot be seen without turning back the leaves. The reader would do well to cut it out before undertaking to use it. Its general excellence is marred by a few errors and omissions. Freiberg is shown as Freiburg. The points Castellau, Giessen, Frankenthal, Marbach, Langendenzlingen, referred to in the text, are not shown on it. The map on page 104 shows Naumburg as Naumberg. On page 371 Wittenberg is referred to as Wittenburg; and on page 365, Freiberg as Freiburg. The maps of battles and sieges give the positions of troops in a satisfactory manner, but do not in all cases show the scale. That the maps of campaigns do not indicate positions of troops or lines of march is especially to be regretted, as the author, in referring to particular points, many of which the reader will never have heard of, does not give the state or province in which they are located.

The body of the work numbers 850 pages, forming sixty-five chapters. The apprehension expressed by the author that the volume errs in being bulky will be a conviction in the mind of the reader. This fault might have been palliated in a measure by the subdivision of the work into parts. One of the divisions should in this case have fallen upon the death of Gustavus, who dies about the middle of the book. The reader will wish that the numbers of troops were given in figures instead of in words. At the end will be found a list of notable marches of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of battles in the same period, with percentages of losses, a list of dates, and an exhaustive index. This book contains a great deal of military information that cannot be found in any other single one, or perhaps in any number of books short of a fair-sized library. It is a valuable work of reference on the revival of the art of war after the Middle Ages, and as such is heartily commended to all who are interested in that subject.

JOHN BIGELOW, JR.

Louis XIV. and the Zenith of the French Monarchy. By ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1895 Pp. xvi, 444.)

MR. HASSALL is right in claiming for Louis XIV. a place among national heroes. Notwithstanding his mediocre intellect, and his overweening vanity, the narrowness of his religious beliefs and the errors of his policy, the monarch who played so great a part in his day has taken his place among the famous men of history. With all his weaknesses, there was in Louis XIV. much that can rightly be called great; of no man could it be more truly said that he was every inch a king; to the duties of his great office he devoted a conscientious and life-long attention; if he enjoyed the pomp of place he did not shirk the responsibilities; there was a dignity in his character of which his dignity of manner was the fitting expression; tenacious of his own position, he was mindful of the rights of inferiors; amidst a bustling world he bore himself with a certain empyrean calm; he met adversity with fortitude; he exerted a great and permanent influence on the age in which he lived and the people over whom he ruled.

Of the long reign which filled three-quarters of a century, Mr. Hassall has given an eminently fair and just review. There is little new to be said of the events of that period, but it is easy to fall into excessive laudation of the king, and still more easy to belittle his character. Louis XIV. has suffered alike from undeserved flattery and from indiscriminate abuse. If historians of his own day constantly proclaimed him the greatest of kings and of men, modern writers have gone as far wrong in announcing that the great monarch was in reality only an exceptionally ignorant and stupid man, governed in turn by an unscrupulous minister, a designing priest, and a bigoted old woman. Mr. Hassall has avoided these extremes and has given a just estimate of an extraordinary character.

On some questions, indeed, we cannot agree with his conclusions. He places a desire to secure the imperial title among the serious ambitions of Louis XIV. If Mr. Hassall had studied the diplomatic correspondence of the French archives, we think he would have seen that the project of obtaining for Louis XIV. the imperial crown was never seriously considered; it assumed no more reality than the visions of empire in the East which haunted Napoleon when he was young; it did not affect the policy of the reign. Dreams of universal empire were attributed to Louis XIV. by his enemies, but in truth a policy which would change the established order of Europe had little attraction for him. His mind was methodical and fond of routine; he was haunted by no vague ambitions; few of his contemporaries had less imagination in their composition. Louis followed in the settled paths of French ambition and was not allured by a policy which would have overthrown all established European traditions. He sought to make France the most influential power in Europe, and in this he succeeded; he longed to be regarded as the most powerful of continental sovereigns, and his wish was gratified. But neither Louis nor his counsellors ever seriously entertained the hope of adding to the dignity of king of France the shadowy halo of the imperial crown.

The errors of Louis' religious policy are fairly stated by Mr. Hassall, and he follows long-established tradition when he says, speaking of those who were driven from France by religious persecution, "The trade of the country went with them, and the rest of Louis' reign is a period of economical decadence." The evils which the revocation of the Edict of Nantes brought on France were indeed great, but an emigration which extended over a quarter of a century and took in all only one per cent. of the population, was not a sufficient cause of decaying industry and declining prosperity. Like many historical traditions, this has been repeated by successive writers without making a rigid examination of the facts. The French Huguenots were industrious, and so also were the French Catholics, and of the Huguenots themselves only one-quarter abandoned their fatherland. The natural increase of population in a growing country would more than compensate for the loss by Huguenot emigration. It is true, as Mr. Hassall says, that the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV. was a period of economical decadence, but Huguenot emigration was a small factor in this result. During a quarter of a century the country enjoyed only four years of peace; the cumbrous and unwise legislation, by which the government sought to regulate and stimulate manufacture and trade, resulted only in checking and crippling them; the cost of the administration became larger and the burden of taxation grew heavier; the errors of Louis' ministers, more than the bigotry of the king, were accountable for the stagnation in business at the close of his reign.

But if some of Mr. Hassall's positions may be questioned, little fault can be found with his presentation of the reign of Louis XIV. as a whole. He describes it during the king's youth, giving just praise to the wise

statesmanship of Mazarin and bestowing just condemnation on the selfish and turbulent movement which took the name of the Fronde. Of the statesmen who helped to make glorious the early years of Louis' personal rule, Mr. Hassall speaks, for the most part, with correctness and good judgment. Sometimes, indeed, he indulges in expressions which a more careful revision would have chastened. "In 1678," he says, "Sir William Temple was much impressed by the wealth and prosperity of France, and this was due entirely to Colbert." To no man has the wealth and prosperity of a country ever been entirely due, and certainly this was not true of Colbert. France is a rich country, because the French people to an extraordinary degree possess the qualities of industry and thrift; she owes her wealth more to her peasants than to her law-makers. That Colbert did much for France is certain, though much less than he desired, and less also than he has sometimes been credited with. When the systems of state interference which he so earnestly fostered, and in which he so sincerely believed, came to be administered by less zealous and less able successors, they crippled the country in its industrial development. In the following century England passed France in the contest for commercial and maritime supremacy, and in part at least this result came because in France industry was held in chains, and in England the individual enjoyed a far larger degree of freedom.

Mr. Hassall follows with care and fairness the mistakes of policy which made the close of Louis XIV.'s reign as disastrous as its beginning had been glorious. He shows how Louis alienated the support of his German allies; how the influence of France in Germany, which Richelieu and Mazarin had established with such pains and skill, was destroyed by the pride of the monarch and the violence and brutality of his war minister; he describes the period of misery and humiliation caused by the War of the Spanish Succession, and tells in fit language of the marvellous fortitude with which the aged king bore adversity.

For those who wish to study the reign of Louis XIV. in its details, a review, brief in comparison with the greatness of the subject, will not tell all they wish to know, but their number is small; the majority have neither time nor inclination for the details of history. They seek a brief but a clear presentation of the great epochs of the past, and of these certainly Louis XIV.'s reign is one. It was an important chapter in the history of a great people; it established France as the foremost European power; it furnished an extraordinary picture of an absolute monarchy, in a highly civilized nation, administered by a king zealous in the political faith of which he was the most brilliant exponent. If one cares for any lessons which the past can teach, the era of Louis XIV. is worthy of study. It was important in literary, in political, and in social development; it had a great influence upon the condition of Europe in the seventeenth century, and its effects were still felt when the French Revolution of the eighteenth century brought the French monarchy to an end.

Mr. Hassall's style has the merits of simplicity and clearness. When

the record of events is condensed into small space, there is little opportunity for picturesque description, for glowing portrayal of character or of famous scenes, and these he has not attempted. His review of Louis XIV.'s reign is eminently correct and just in its general outlines, it is free from prejudice, and will make a useful addition to the series to which it belongs.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. By HENRY M. BAIRD. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Two vols., pp. 566, 580.)

IN *The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* Professor Baird closes the series, in which he has narrated the history of the Huguenot party in France. It represents the labor of thirty years, and the author can count as the fruit of the large part of his active life which he has devoted to this subject, the honorable position that his books have gained for him among American historians.

His last work possesses the merits of its predecessors and is subject to the same criticisms. Professor Baird is of Huguenot descent; he is Huguenot in his religious beliefs; he has devoted much of his life to the study of the Huguenot cause. It is natural that he should be a Protestant from strong conviction. There are few acts of the Huguenot party in which he finds aught to blame, and little in the conduct of their opponents in which he finds anything to praise.

It is not always easy to decide how much a decided bias in the writer affects the value of historical writings. In most great historical questions there is a right and a wrong, and the man who is not able to discover where lies the right is not a useful teacher for posterity. A vehement conviction of the justice of a cause may make an historical recital glow with life; strict impartiality, a perfectly calm and well-balanced judgment, sometimes produce only a chilly and passionless record of the past, from which the reader gains little except weariness. *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* was the work of an intense partisan. The history of the same period, written by some cool and indifferent critic, who saw defects in the character of William of Orange and merits in that of Philip II., would not have possessed the fascination of Motley's dramatic narration.

During the early part of the seventeenth century the Huguenot party was involved in frequent contests with the general government; they ceased only when its power was broken by Richelieu and it was no longer an important element in French politics. In this protracted controversy Professor Baird's sympathies are with those of his own faith; he finds justification for their conduct, and regrets the success of Richelieu's policy. It is only just to say that he presents the facts with fairness. If, indeed, there is an issue between a Protestant and a Catholic authority,

it would be hard for Professor Baird to accept the latter, but there is no great dispute about the facts. The details of brutal and illegal acts by members of the dominant party are often exaggerated by the writers of the persecuted faith; the unruliness of the Huguenots is often exaggerated by their opponents. But no one disputes that the members of the reformed faith wished to make of their religious body a political organization; that they were strenuous in obtaining means of protection against interference by the government; that they assumed the right to raise soldiers and levy war against the king when, in their judgment, their rights were infringed upon. In short, their position was much like that of some of the great and turbulent nobles when Richelieu became the ruler of France.

There is as little doubt about the views of the cardinal, for they are repeatedly stated in his own writings. He was resolved that the Huguenots should be reduced to the same condition as other subjects of the king, that they should no longer constitute a separate body within the state, that they should render to the sovereign the same prompt obedience that was yielded by all other French citizens. Such a purpose was certainly justifiable; there was no distinction between feudal disturbance and religious disturbance; a fortified camp in La Rochelle or Montauban, which refused obedience to the orders of the general government, was as much an obstacle to any effective administration as a fortified castle held by the Prince of Condé or the Duke of Bouillon. If France was to become a powerful and an orderly monarchy, it was as necessary that the Huguenots should cease to be turbulent, as that the nobles should cease to be unruly.

Not only did the Huguenot party interpose a vigorous resistance to the fulfilment of Richelieu's plans, but they were often the aggressors. It was, indeed, on the claim that their privileges had been invaded, but such disturbances checked Richelieu in his foreign policy, and he resolved to put an end to them. When the Huguenot leaders had aided an insurrection instigated by a selfish and unruly nobleman like Condé, when they had sought the assistance of the King of Spain with which to oppose the King of France, it is hard to see how they could justly complain if their power to do such things was destroyed. The development, the good order, the power and glory of the kingdom as a whole, were the ends for which Richelieu strove, and he would not allow any religious sect to stand in his way.

Nor did the overthrow of the political power of the reformed party at all interfere with the religious freedom which the Edict of Nantes secured for them. After La Rochelle was captured, the cardinal made his solemn declaration that all loyal subjects of the king should receive equal treatment, that members of either creed should find the same favor with him. Professor Baird admits that Richelieu was true to his word. He himself says that from the fall of La Rochelle until Louis XIV. in person assumed the reins of government, there was a period of tranquillity and contentment for the Huguenot party. These were indeed the halcyon days for

those of the reformed faith in France. They had ceased to be turbulent, they received the just protection of wise and patriotic ministers like Richelieu and Mazarin. The overthrow of their unruly power brought thirty years of peace and prosperity to the Protestants, while the misfortunes that were in store for them could not have been averted by political assemblies or cities of defence.

There is little room for any disagreement with Professor Baird's views as to the treatment of the Protestants by Louis XIV. The Huguenot persecution, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the unwise and impotent attempt to turn Huguenots into good Catholics, form one of the most lamentable chapters in the history of that king. For nothing did he receive more adulation in his lifetime than for the pretended conversion of a million and a half of Protestants; for no act has he been more condemned by posterity than for a persecution which would have been odious in the thirteenth century, and was much more odious in the seventeenth century.

There is nothing to be said in favor of Louis XIV.; his conduct was neither just, nor generous, nor wise, nor effective, and if Professor Baird finds no good in the monarch, so far as his treatment of the Protestants goes, he cannot be charged with overstating the case. The record of this long and futile effort at conversion is one of the most curious chapters in the history of bigotry. It was a phase of persecution which can find no defenders, even among the most zealous of persecutors; it had not the poor justification that it accomplished its end. Never did a long course of ill treatment, visited upon the members of any sect, produce so scanty results. In Spain the fury of persecution was greater, and it accomplished its purpose; however great the cost to national character and national wealth, the state was purged of heresy. The dragonnades and the galleys under Louis XIV. were enough to injure the prosperity of the country, to outrage the rights of good citizens, and to incur the condemnation of posterity; they were not conducted with sufficient judgment or continued with sufficient pertinacity, to drive the wanderers into the fold of the Church.

A hundred years were occupied in these futile efforts at conversion. In the eighteenth century attempts at persecution were sporadic, and on the whole the condition of the Protestants in France improved. New ideas had moderated the intense Catholicism of the last century, and bigotry was becoming out of date. The Huguenots again met to join in the services of their faith, at first with danger, at last almost unnoticed by the government.

In 1787 the work of repression at last ceased, and the efforts of Louis XIV. to make all Frenchmen of one religion were abandoned. The edict of Louis XVI., if it granted only scanty privileges to those of the Protestant faith, was a formal announcement that the era of persecution had ended.

Professor Baird treats the history of the Huguenots with much ful-

ness. He covers, indeed, a long period; from the death of Henry IV. until religious privileges were again granted to those of the Protestant faith, almost two centuries passed. Yet the Huguenot movement constituted only one chapter in the history of the French people, and in two large volumes, of almost 600 pages each, the successive phases of religious conflict and religious persecution are delineated in considerable detail.

What is the just measure of space to give to any period is an embarrassing question for an historical writer. The most readable histories owe their interest to their fulness of detail; the bare outlines of the past are often repellent; it is to the sketches of individual character, the pictures of bygone society, the anecdote and incident, that the historical page usually owes its life and charm. Wealth of detail has indeed its perils; if it is delightful when the narrator is a Macaulay or a Parkman, it is far otherwise when the tale is tamely told, and the wearied reader toils through a tedious recital of uninteresting facts.

Professor Baird writes well and clearly, though sometimes the general situation is slightly obscured; the varied incidents of persecution do not always assist in giving a clear idea of the varying conditions of the Huguenot movement.

To the large body of earnest believers, for whom the sufferings and the heroism of their ancestors possess far greater interest than the wars of Louis XIV. or the writings of the philosophical school, this work, with the sketches of many a renowned leader of the cause, the accounts of many a famous temple of the faith, the narrations of danger and distress patiently endured in the name of the Lord, will seem none too full.

In this all will agree: that Professor Baird has now completed a history of the Huguenot party in France which, in scholarship, in conscientious investigation, in comprehensive treatment of every phase of a movement spread over almost three centuries, is not equalled by any work on this subject, either in French or in English.

JAMES BRECK PERKINS.

The Private Life of Warren Hastings, First Governor-General of India. By Sir CHARLES LAWSON. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. viii, 254.)

MUCH has been written of recent years upon the life and achievements of Warren Hastings, the great statesman who laid the foundations of the British Empire in India. But in spite of the labors of his apologists, Hastings is still mainly known to the world from the glowing pages of the famous essay which Macaulay wrote upon the appearance of the first biography of the Governor-General, written by Mr. G. R. Gleig. So great is the fascination of Macaulay's style, that subsequent writers upon Hastings have been apt to start with the assumption that they must devote themselves to a refutation of Macaulay's statements, instead of working upon and supplementing the materials supplied and quoted by Gleig. That the brilliant

essayist made several serious mistakes in his essay on Hastings is universally admitted by all writers upon the history of the English in India, but the works which correct these mistakes do not reach the hands of one in a hundred of the readers of the essay. It may be regarded either as a tribute to the genius of Macaulay or as an instance of the unkindness of fate that Impey is branded, seemingly forever, as a corrupt judge, and that Hastings is still regarded as the plunderer of the Begums of Oudh, as the murderer of Nuncomar, and as the ruthless destroyer of the Rohilla nation, in spite of the most positive proof to the contrary. Influenced by the indignant rhetoric of Burke and the ornate eloquence of Sheridan, and relying for his facts upon the somewhat prosaic pages of Mr. Gleig, Macaulay passed certain unjust judgments, which modern historians, in spite of all their labor, have been unable to reverse.

It is perhaps worth while to recapitulate briefly the work which has been done of recent years towards the clearing of the fame of Hastings from the aspersions of Lord Macaulay. First in point of date came the *Life of Sir Elijah Impey*, published by his son, Mr. E. B. Impey, a few years after the appearance of Macaulay's essay. In this far too bulky volume, filial piety entirely cleared the character of Hastings' old school-fellow, the first Chief Justice of Bengal, and incidentally acquitted Hastings of using his high office to interfere with the ends of justice, but the style of the book was so intolerable that it never attained a wide circulation. Within the last few years two men of far greater ability than Mr. E. B. Impey, both of them statesmen of Indian experience and writers of acknowledged merit, have undertaken to remove the two most serious imputations that rested on the fame of Hastings. Sir James Stephen, the eminent judge, and still more eminent jurist, who for some years held the office of Legislative Member of the Viceroy's Council, applied his trained judicial mind and singular power of analysis to one episode in the career of the Governor-General which Macaulay placed in the most odious light, and in his *Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey* successfully vindicated the action of Hastings in that particular matter. More recently Sir John Strachey, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and a well-known Indian administrator, used the local knowledge he had acquired upon the scene of action, supplemented by the careful study of original documents, to show in his *Hastings and the Rohilla War* that Macaulay grossly exaggerated the effect of the evidence in his possession, and that the policy of the Governor-General was not only justifiable but humane. The three volumes of *Selections from the Bengal Records*, edited by Mr. Forrest, throw an immense amount of further light upon the transactions between Hastings and his Council, and reveal in striking fashion the industry of the Governor-General and his perfect comprehension of Indian affairs. Among secondary books upon Hastings may be noted the masterly little life by Sir Alfred Lyall in the "English Men of Action" series, the biography by Captain Trotter, making use of the Forrest selections, in the Oxford "Rulers of India" series,

and the more comprehensive and thorough history of his public administration, published last year by Colonel Malleon. Mention should also be made of the charming sketches of Anglo-Indian society in the time of Hastings, published by Dr. Busted under the title of *Echoes of Old Calcutta*.

To this Hastings literature, Sir Charles Lawson's book is a welcome addition. He takes up a theme entirely neglected by the historical and biographical writers hitherto, and devotes himself to a study of the private life of his hero, with particular attention to his latter years after his return from India and final settlement at Daylesford in Worcestershire, the home of his forefathers. Hastings, the statesman, has been so much written about that there is danger of forgetting Hastings, the man. Sir Charles Lawson, who was for many years well known in India as the proprietor and editor of *The Madras Mail*, has long been interested in the details of Hastings' private life, and some years ago published a beautifully illustrated brochure dealing with this subject. His book is essentially an enlargement of the brochure and is also full of illustrations, including portraits of Hastings, Mrs. Hastings, and others, views of places mentioned and reproductions of caricatures issued by Gillray and others at the time of Hastings' trial. It only pretends to be anecdotic and descriptive, and it would perhaps be too hard to apply the strictest canons of historical criticism to a volume that is professedly the production of the hardly-won leisure of a busy Anglo-Indian journalist. In a more pretentious work it would be impossible not to censure severely the absurd statement that the great-grandson of a knight who flourished in the reign of Edward I. died in 1627. He is said indeed to have been eighty-two years old at the time of his death, but his father and grandfather must each have lived for considerably over a century before their successors came into the world, if Sir Charles Lawson is to be taken seriously. The author's assumption that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the letters of Junius, in the chapter devoted to the arch-enemy of Hastings, is likely to irritate students of the Junius controversy, who are now well aware that the Franciscan authorship is far from being proved, and attribute the assertions that he was Junius to the vanity of an aged and conceited man. It would be possible to point out other flaws in Sir Charles Lawson's *The Private Life of Warren Hastings*, but it would be ungracious to do so; the book does not pretend to be a contribution to history; it is rather a contribution to anecdotic biography, and possesses historical value only in so far that it throws light upon the education, the married life, the domestic habits, the friends and enemies, and the latter days of the most distinguished of the many famous proconsuls who built up the great edifice of the British Empire in India.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

Catherine II. et la Révolution Française, d'après de nouveaux documents. Par CH. DE LARIVIÈRE. Avec préface de ALFRED RAMBAUD, professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris, Membre correspondant de l'Académie des Sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg. (Paris: H. Le Soudier. 1895. Pp. xxxiii, 396.)

M. LARIVIÈRE'S book is one of four volumes in which he is to describe Catherine's private life, her family, favorites, friends, and opinions. This account of her attitude towards the French Revolution belongs, chronologically, to the conclusion of the series, but the author has published it first, doubtless, because the subject has great importance in the studies on the Revolution now so eagerly pursued, and also on account of the special interest the French feel in the story of their relations with Russia. As M. Alfred Rambaud remarks in the preface he has fittingly been asked to write: "Les amis de l'alliance franco-russe voient nettement, aujourd'hui, le point d'arrivée; dans ce livre ils trouveront le point de départ." M. Larivière has conscientiously mastered the literature of his subject, an excellent bibliography of which he prints at the end of his book. Since he desired to sketch the figure of Catherine chiefly according to her correspondence, he has depended largely for his material upon the great *Recueil de la Société Impériale d'Histoire de Russie*, which already includes ninety-three volumes quarto. A work of this character could not be expected to change the interpretation of the Russian policy during the Revolution expounded by Von Sybel, Brückner, and Sorel; but it does throw light upon certain phases of the problem and adds in fuller detail Catherine's characterizations of the Revolutionary movement and its European counterplay.

According to M. Larivière, Catherine's liberal inclinations had developed into a conservatism rapidly becoming reactionary before the Revolution began. The transition dated from the execution of Pougatchef in 1775, and continued until 1788. Her experience of power, "son métier de souveraine," led her gradually to abandon the philosophers whom she had cajoled as long as her "glory" had need of them. This does not mean that her vaunted liberality of mind was mere pose: it was sincere to a degree, but not to the degree implied in her earlier eulogies of the philosophers. Though she had a real love of humanity and was liberal by instinct and by education, her liberalism was always, says M. Larivière, obedient to one guide—self-interest. Moreover in principle it was the liberalism of the eighteenth-century enlightened despot. It had little in common with the spirit which wrought such fundamental changes in France after 1789. If oppression took traditional forms, in her eyes it was not oppression but law. Arbitrariness was what she detested. Her notion of liberty makes this clear. While she was still a grand-duchess she wrote: "Liberté, âme de toutes choses, sans vous tout est mort. Je veux qu'on obéisse aux lois, mais point d'esclavage. Je veux un but général de rendre heureux, et point de caprice, ni de bizarrerie, ni de

tyrannie qui y déroge." According to this, liberty is the freedom of the individual from unreasonable and vexatious interference; but the individual must content himself with the limits historically set for his walk and conversation, and never try to reset those limits to fit any new, metaphysical theory of society. A Russian serf might be said to enjoy a measure of liberty so defined. When the triumphant Jacobins of 1793 talked about "saving liberty," they did not mean such liberty at all; they meant an ideal social structure, erected on the foundation of equality and popular sovereignty, and in almost every respect contrary to that ancient régime under which alone Catherine felt that her sort of liberty could flourish. Perhaps they had as much respect for individual liberty as Catherine, for she did not hesitate to sacrifice it if it clashed with imperial authority, any more than they when it often took sides with the counter-revolution. Even her most strikingly liberal act, the organization of the great Legislative Commission in 1767, to revise and codify the laws, had little substantial value. The Commission was, as M. Larivière remarks, "trop inspirée de l'avis officiel," and "servile vis-à-vis du pouvoir, n'ayant de l'indépendance que l'apparence." Catherine would have tolerated nothing else, however acute her "legislomanie" became.

When the Notables and the States-General met, Catherine compared them to her Legislative Commission and showed herself thus to be "à cent lieues de se douter que les États-Généraux représentent la vraie France, et voudront être obéis." In case their spirits became heated they might, she suggested, be regaled with a bit of vigorous foreign policy, say an interference in Holland against the Stadtholder's party. But the capture of the Bastille instantly dissipated these Machiavellian illusions. Henceforward Catherine had only hard words for the National Assembly and for everybody else in France except the *émigrés* whom a false sense of honor and an untimely solicitude for their own safety had led across the frontier. The Assembly was "l'hydre aux 1200 têtes," composed of "avocats," "procureurs," "savetiers," "cordonniers," and the Revolution was "L'Égrillarde." Even the poor King got his share of abuse, for she told her private secretary, Khrapovitski, that Louis was responsible. "Il est ivre chaque soir," she said, "et le mène qui veut: d'abord Breteuil, du parti de la reine; puis le prince de Condé et le comte d'Artois; enfin Lafayette." Nor did her respect for him increase when France, in 1792, came to have virtually three ministers at the Court of Saint Petersburg: M. Genet officially representing the French government, Comte d'Esterhazy managing the interests of the Comte d'Artois, while the Marquis de Bombelles represented Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette personally. Catherine had no patience with "gens qui agissent sans discontinuer avec deux avis parfaitement contradictoires, l'un en public, l'autre en secret."

However vehement Catherine's hatred and condemnation of the Revolution became, she was too clear-sighted to be led into any attempt at armed intervention contrary to Russia's real interests, which centred in

Poland and at Constantinople rather than on the Rhine. Although at one time she appeared to support the project of Gustavus III. for a descent on the coast of Normandy, M. Larivière proves that "elle le fit sans enthousiasme et avec l'arrière-pensée de l'éviter," and she felt relieved when the Swedish king's death terminated her agreement with him. Her desire for the restoration of the Bourbon kings to absolute authority was largely due to her hope that France might unite with her in the settlement of the Eastern question. This hope the Revolution had defeated. The day after the Bastille was taken, her ambassador, Simoline, had written: "Ce serait une illusion de compter maintenant sur l'alliance de la France, et, encore plus, sur son importance politique." But France might still be made to serve her purposes if by its Revolution her own rivals, Austria and Prussia, could be kept busy in the west while she absorbed or destroyed the kingdom of Poland. In 1792 she confessed to Khrapovitski: "Je me casse la tête pour entraîner les cours de Vienne et de Berlin à s'immiscer dans les affaires de France . . . je veux les engager dans les affaires avoir les coudées franches. J'ai en vue beaucoup d'entreprises inachevées et il faut qu'ils soient occupés pour ne pas m'entraver dans l'exécution." This passage leaves nothing to be desired in explicitness. Moreover it is significant of the real game the European powers began to play from the moment the Revolution weakened France and menaced them. The intention attributed to them of fighting to restore the Bourbons was simply a convenient popular illusion. Conquests and provinces were their real aim, as M. Sorel has so brilliantly shown. The France of 1792-1794 is to be studied in the full consciousness of such dangers to its unity, and not judged merely in accordance with abstract ethical considerations which had no standing in the European politics of the period. M. Larivière gives Catherine full credit for her steadfastness in the pursuit of her purpose during those tumultuous years. Without sufficient justification, nevertheless, he appears to consider her assertion that she meant to fight Jacobinism at Warsaw an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the world. May 9, 1792, a few days after she had ordered her troops to invade Poland, she wrote to Grimm: "Apparemment vous ignorez que la Jacobinière de Varsovie est en correspondance régulière avec celle de Paris." Catherine was sincere enough in writing this. The Polish patriots, the authors of the constitution of May 3, 1791, had repeatedly called to mind the example set by the French National Assembly,¹ and in that Assembly, soon after the news of the Polish revolution reached Paris, Menou referred to the Diet in these words: "Ce sénat . . . vient par un élan sublime d'amour pour la liberté et de respect pour les droits des peuples, d'adopter les principales bases de notre constitution."² Catherine was not far out of the way in thinking that the two movements embodied the same premise, so pernicious in her eyes, namely, "Dans la société tout pouvoir émane essentiellement de la volonté de la nation."³

¹ Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, II. 214.

² *Moniteur*, VIII. 843. ³ Quoted by Sorel, II. 213.

M. Larivière practically acknowledges that this principle was what she seemed to detest in the French Revolution, for he remarks that she never drew any line of distinction between the Constituent and the Legislative Assembly or the Convention. Still he finds some contradiction in Catherine's conduct because she supported the champions of despotic authority for France, while at the same time she sought to destroy the strong monarchical government provided in Poland by the new constitution. This is a confusion of mind due to the similarity of words covering totally dissimilar processes. It is safe to say that the *émigrés* would never have subscribed to a constitution like that of Poland, neither would the Polish patriots have struggled for a monarchy after the ideals cherished at Coblenz.

In one instance Catherine showed herself astonishingly liberal even when the reactionary spirit had seemingly taken complete possession of her mind. This was the retention of La Harpe at court as the tutor of her grandsons, one of whom was to become the Emperor Alexander, although La Harpe did not hesitate to identify the cause of political and social Revolution with that of philosophy. M. Larivière might have added point to his description of this affair had he quoted the young Alexander's remark to Prince Adam Czartoryski about the French Revolution, instead of alluding only to the controversy in which Alexander argued against the principle of hereditary monarchies. Alexander said that "he had taken the strongest interest in the French Revolution, and that while condemning its terrible excesses, he wished the French Republic success and rejoiced at its establishment."¹

The later chapters of M. Larivière's book give much curious information about Catherine's opinions of men like Necker and Mirabeau, and her dealings with Sénac de Meilhan, who proposed to write a history of her reign. In the sections on Necker he carries minute scholarship to a profitless extent in writing six pages on what Catherine thought of Madame Necker, with the conclusion that she evidently regarded Madame Necker as a meritorious woman: "Tout, du moins, porte à le croire; car elle s'abstint de le dire." As an appendix to his work M. Larivière publishes the remarkable memoir of Catherine on the Revolution, written in 1792, which serves to confirm the conclusions he has reached. There are a few errors in the proof-reading of dates which will doubtless be corrected in a subsequent edition.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Napoleone: Una Pagina storico-psicologica del Genio. Per AUGUSTO TEBALDI, professore nella R. Università di Padova. (Padova: Angelo Draghi. 1895. Pp. iii, 168.)

WE have in this book a study of Napoleon from the point of view of a professor of mental diseases. His apology for offering a new contribution

¹ *Memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski*, edited by Adam Gielgud (London, 1888), I. iii.

to the literature of this subject is that his point of view and his line of inquiry are novel ones. Holding aloof from the expression of any judgment upon Napoleon as a captain, politician, or legislator, he proposes to himself the examination of the following thesis: "If the psychical manifestations of the individual are the resultant of the organic conditions of his being and of the environment in which his activities unfold themselves, many facts of the mind and heart of Napoleon find their explanation in his organism." The novelty of his effort consists not in his undertaking to make a psychological study of his subject, not in the examination of physical qualities and predispositions, but in his relegation of the historical element so far to the rear. This last he makes use of only in so far as it helps to throw light upon Napoleon's physical and psychical states at various stages of his career. This complete abdication, however, of the office of critic leads to results which can fairly be called partial. Such must be the case when one has to do with a many-sided individual. One noteworthy mistake of this kind is the author's apparently serious treatment of Napoleon's threat to resign his command in 1796 on the alleged ground of ill-health. Another is the emphasis put upon his gradual physical breakdown and the consequent loss of mental strength, to account for his final overthrow. However great the difference between the Bonaparte of 1796 and the Napoleon of 1815, — and perhaps the difference was not so great as has often been supposed, — the difference between his opponents of 1796 and those of 1815 was infinitely greater. The Napoleon of 1815 was sufficiently like the Bonaparte of 1796 to have won his Italian campaigns over again against such leaders as he then faced. Twenty years had wrought greater changes in the conditions, institutions, and peoples of Europe than in Napoleon.

Professor Tebaldi, however, does not pretend to give a complete psycho-physical formula to explain the puzzle of the Corsican's career, but to have made clear some facts with reference to his physical constitution which contribute not a little to an understanding of his psychical manifestations. The method of treatment is that of the physician's diagnosis, and naturally, therefore, the author begins with the family history, more particularly with the weaknesses of body and the qualities of mind and character of his subject's parents. From that he passes to a minute examination of the subject himself, the measurements of his body and the characteristics of his physique. The acute nervous sensibility which manifested itself in numberless ways is particularly remarked. It is the source of his great powers; his energy, his command of himself, his faculty of suppressing every impression or idea except those which at any moment are in the field of consciousness, the extraordinarily rapid working of his mind, his marvellous impressional receptivity. On the other hand, this nervous sensibility was a contributing cause of constantly increasing potency in the aggravation of his organic disorders, of the attacks of dizziness and faintness which some have called epilepsy. The author marshals the conflicting testimonies upon this point. In the end he reaches

no positive conclusion with regard to it, but contents himself by saying that if Napoleon was not an epileptic in the ordinary sense of that word, he certainly belonged to a family of "neuropathetics."

Closely allied with this nervous sensibility and this epileptic temperament, and largely accounted for by them, was the weak moral sense. Napoleon's psychical nature was so absorbed, so dominated by his intelligence, that little room was left for anything else. The author quotes with approval Lombroso's comparison of Napoleon with Cæsar, Mohammed, and other conquerors, as epileptic geniuses. When the epileptic tendency displays itself in the psychical field mental exuberances are more than likely to appear. "With a constitution of that kind not a few men of talent represent the unbalanced, the abnormal, the delinquent among geniuses."

JOHN H. CONEY.

Lord John Russell. By STUART J. REID. [The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1895. Pp. xvi, 381.)

SEVERAL years ago Spencer Walpole published a two-volume octavo biography of Earl Russell, or Lord John Russell, as he is known to history by his own preference. It received much praise and has since been regarded as the authority. Mr. Reid had no desire to supersede this with his monograph; evidently his aim was to reduce to the form of a brief and popular narrative the most accessible material and some important recollections respecting Russell. Lord John's political career does not readily lend itself to short and picturesque biography. Sydney Smith might well have said of his friend "Lord John Reformer," as he did of Melbourne, "I accuse our Minister of honesty and diligence." Russell also fulfilled Goethe's condition of greatness: he was devoted to one idea. But this was not all; with almost equal honesty and diligence he was also devoted to many other ideas, throughout a period of over half a century. When we thought of his part in the long contest over the change from rotten boroughs to a rational system of parliamentary representation, in the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, in bringing about Catholic Emancipation, in repealing the miserable Corn Laws and introducing the grand policy of Free Trade, in helping Ireland to more freedom and keeping her from starvation, in guiding the foreign policy during the war in the Crimea, in helping Italy to become a nation, and in trying to hold England to a just course of neutrality during our own Civil War, — when we thought of merely these questions, we did not expect to find that Mr. Reid had given more than a synopsis of historical events and biographical incidents. Instead of doing only this, he has written a vivacious and charming biography which assigns Lord John his proper place in history. The success is extraordinary. It is not often that small biographies of great statesmen add much to the knowledge of the reader or to the reputation of the hero. Mr. Reid has furnished an exception.

Russell wrote of himself shortly before his death: "I have committed

many errors, some of them very gross blunders. But the generous people of England are always forbearing and forgiving to those statesmen who have the good of their country at heart." Mr. Reid is in no sense a hero-worshipper, but he has taken more pains to describe Lord John's successes and great traits than to note his failings and less praiseworthy characteristics, although he has a keen eye for Palmerston's Jingoism and for his impetuous disregard for the instructions of his superiors. While it would be ungracious to emphasize the point, it is to be regretted that more has not been told about Russell's life as a partisan Whig, and how he personally accepted victory and defeat. A philosophical American statesman once said, "The faults of great men fall out in history." This is much truer than it ought to be. Every political biography that pretends to be a study of character should disprove this remark quite as much as it should that familiar sentence of Mark Antony about "the evil that men do." Biographers will never receive the respect and confidence which is given to impartial historians until they make it their business to tell the whole truth and think less of eulogy.

Americans will naturally turn first to the chapter covering the period of our Civil War, when Earl Russell, as he had lately become, held the seals of the Foreign Office. This is the least satisfactory part of the book. The printing of a valuable six-page memorandum, about how the law officers failed to act in time to prevent the sailing of the *Alabama*, by the late Lord Selborne, who was then Solicitor-General, saves it from being next to worthless. Not a word is said about England's hurried recognition of the Confederacy as a belligerent in the spring of 1861, before the new American Minister could reach London. Nor does he tell how Lord John was driven back by Seward from his first step toward mediation, nor how, finally, the development of our antislavery policy created such strong English sympathy that he ceased to encourage Mason's hopes or even to listen to Napoleon's schemes. Evidently Mr. Reid has not given much attention to the relations between Great Britain and the United States at this time. Here are some surprising statements: "Hostilities had broken out between the North and the South in the previous July, and the opinion of England was sharply divided on the merits of the struggle. The bone of contention, to put the matter concisely, was the refusal of South Carolina and ten other States to submit to the authority of the Central Government of the Union. It was an old quarrel which had existed from the foundation of the American Commonwealth, for the individual States of the Union had always been jealous of any infringement of the right of self-government; but slavery was now the ostensible root of bitterness, and matters were complicated by radical divergences on the subject of tariffs" (p. 310). Nevertheless Mr. Reid has written a biography which shows that he is a scholar and a literary man of uncommon qualities. The historian Lecky has furnished several very interesting pages of his own recollections of Lord John as he knew him in private life after 1866.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

The Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, Bart., K.C.S.I., a Judge of the High Court of Justice. By his Brother, LESLIE STEPHEN. With two Portraits. (London and New York: G. P. Putman's Sons. 1895. Pp. 504.)

ALL those who knew Fitzjames Stephen and his books will find a melancholy pleasure in this capital biography. It gives his ancestry, interesting in itself, and valuable in showing the hereditary traits that characterized the man and his methods of thought and work. It shows him in his Cambridge days, when his associates and contemporaries predicted a future of even more distinction than that he achieved by a lifetime of conscientious work and study. At college, just as later at the Bar and on the Bench, he fell short of attaining the highest honors, but this was largely due to the fact that he worked for work's sake, rather than for reward. What he was in his youth, he remained to the end, earnest, zealous, aiming at the best, tireless in the pursuit of good to others. He came of a sturdy Scotch stock, full of zeal and energy, never directed to selfish ends, and often failing in achievement. His grandfather, "Master" Stephen, made a mark first as a political partisan, but later as one of Wilberforce's most trusted supporters in the contest against slavery. His father, the "King" James of contemporary memoirs, was long an official in the Colonial Department, and gradually rose to such a position of power and authority that he was recognized as the controlling influence under a succession of political chiefs. His Ecclesiastical Essays and his Lectures on French History make up his literary baggage, valuable, yet small in proportion to his wide and deep studies and the appreciation in which he was held by able men. His wife, Fitzjames' mother, was a daughter of the Rev. John Venn of Clapham, a leader of what has often been called in derision the "Clapham sect," the strict evangelicals, of whom the Stephens, the Wilberforces, and the Macaulays were perhaps the most noted members. From his mother and from the Venns, a long line of clergymen of the same theological views from the days of Queen Elizabeth to those of Queen Victoria, Sir J. F. Stephen inherited a large share of the qualities that distinguished him. It was characteristic of the stock from which he descended that his theological opinions were independent of any mere authority, the results of his own sturdy logical processes, and reasoned out for himself. As a young man he associated with his father's friends, among them such men as Sir Henry Taylor, James Spedding, Aubrey de Vere, John Austin, John Mill, and this association did more for him than Cambridge or the Inns of Court. Eton, King's College, London, and Trinity College, Cambridge, were the successive stages of his education, but he was too independent to follow beaten paths, and therefore never achieved great honors. As one of the "apostles," the accepted nickname for a Cambridge debating society, he became an associate of Sir Henry Sumner Maine, Lord Derby, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, Julian Fane, and Canon Holland. Although his father and his uncles, the Venns,

hoped that he would become a clergyman, his own sound sense discerned his greater fitness for the Bar, and after the usual studies, he was called in 1854. He had several years earlier begun to write for the newspapers and periodicals, and for years he was a frequent and valued contributor to the *Saturday Review*. The three volumes of his *Hora Sabbaticæ* show him at his best in the work in which he delighted, although he himself said later on in life that he had indulged too freely in the luxury of writing for the press. He wrote abundantly and vigorously, and was an ardent advocate of law reform, at first on the lines laid down by Bentham, but later in the direction of his own method of codification of the law, to which he gave the impetus in India, and for the promotion of which he vainly sought a seat in Parliament. It was as secretary of the royal commission of 1858 on popular education that he made his impression on the noteworthy men under and with whom he worked, and his reward was his appointment as Recorder of Newark, the first round on the judicial ladder up which he slowly climbed to the top. He was never successful at the Bar, so far as winning a great and lucrative practice, but he impressed judges and lawyers by his learning and ability, and won the esteem and confidence of solicitors and clients by his honesty and straightforwardness. His contributions to legal literature, other than occasional essays in reviews and magazines, began in 1863 with his *General View of the Criminal Law of England*, and this was followed by his *Digest of the Law of Evidence*, and that of *the Criminal Law*, and a *History of the Criminal Law of England*. But useful and successful as these have been as law books, he never became a great legal author. He followed at the outset Bentham and Austin, and was slow at first to recognize the great value of the historical methods first applied by Maine to the science of law; yet the labor expended on his articles in the *Pall Mall* and other periodicals would have made him a sound historical lawyer, and thus completed the equipment he needed for the work so well done by Maine and his school. In 1869 he succeeded Maine in the position once filled by Macaulay, as legal member of the Council in India, and, remaining there until 1872, he carried forward the work inaugurated by Maine, giving to India a series of codes in the shape of well-prepared statutes, far beyond the Penal Code prepared by Macaulay in 1834. Stephen's work in India has been the subject of much adverse criticism, and much of it has been recast by his able successors from time to time. It was rather by his success in bringing home to the minds of the vast population of India that it was governed by laws securing absolute justice to every man, than by technical merit, that Stephen made his mark as a law reformer in India. His return to England brought him back to the scenes of his earlier training and work, fitted by his hard work in India to undertake and cope with great tasks in government, in legislation, and in the administration of law, the one department that he always upheld as the best and most honorable in Great Britain. His book *Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity*, published in 1873, the first fruits of his enforced leisure

while he was preparing to resume his practice at the Bar, was a profound discussion of first principles of ethics, an open dissent from Mill, an avowed departure from his earlier allegiance to Bentham and the utilitarian school, and largely influenced by the lesson he had learned in India of the value of a strong and powerful government. Then came another unsuccessful effort to gain a seat in Parliament, and more plans for books and more efforts to secure some measure of codification of English law. In the preparation of bills of this kind he gathered the material which went to the making of his later law books; and by his persistent effort to gain a hearing for the cause he had so much at heart he enlisted the sympathy of his co-workers, won the respect of even his opponents, and at last enjoyed the reward of a high judicial position from the men who governed England, while his appointment was heartily approved alike by Bench and Bar, and by all of the public for whose good opinion he had any respect. It was during this waiting period that he became a member of that curious body called the Metaphysical Club, whose discussions led him to the preparation of papers printed in *Fraser's* and the *Contemporary* and the *Nineteenth Century*, where he met in open literary warfare Manning and Ward and Gladstone, showing concentrated vigor, strong power of reasoning, and real grasp of the difficult problems at issue. His real and his best work was done in the preparation of a penal code, on which he expended great labor, enlisted strong support, secured a royal commission, only to see his labor and its results finally swallowed up in the general vortex of a change of government, with which vanished his last hope of being able to secure the codifying of any part of English law.

With Froude and Carlyle, with the Stracheys and with Lord Lytton, Stephen was on terms of close intimacy, — indeed his friendship with Lord Lytton was almost romantic in its growth, from an interchange of views just as Lytton was going out to India, to the most exhaustive correspondence on all subjects of contemporary interest, — with the most marked results on their political faith.

From 1875 until he became a judge in 1879, Stephen was Professor of Common Law at the Inns of Court. His lectures on evidence naturally led him to the preparation of a text-book, his *Digest of the English Law of Evidence*, in which he "boiled down" his material to a size that made the book useful alike to student and practitioner. It was but another of his efforts to show that the law was capable of being taught on a foundation of reason and common sense and made a beautiful and instructive branch of science. He endeavored to show the possibility of codifying as a private enterprise; he suggested the formation of a council of legal literature, to co-operate with the councils for law reporting and legal education; he called attention to the utility of a translation of the year-books, the first sources of the legal antiquary, and the continued publishing of the State Trials, — both now steadily going forward; and urged a collection of the laws of the British Empire. All this time he was in growing practice in complicated and involved cases, — requiring great and close application

of even his strong reasoning powers, yet he found or made opportunity to rewrite and recast his *History of the Criminal Law*, in which he put to practical use the historical methods of Maine and his school, to which Stephen came at last. The growth of the criminal law is closely connected with the development of the moral sense of the community, with all the great political and social revolutions, and with the changes of the ecclesiastical constitution and the religious belief of the nation. Almost unconsciously at first, but at last with a full recognition of the change, he had left the school of Bentham and Austin, and his *History of the Criminal Law* was complementary to the great constitutional histories of Hallam and Stubbs. He frankly acknowledged his obligations to them, but he made special investigations in his own field and produced a history of interest and value as bringing out certain correlative processes in the legal development of English institutions which constitutional histories naturally left in the background. He won the acknowledgment of very competent judges for his thorough mastery of the antiquities of the law, and yet it was a task not at all congenial to his love of general principles. Stephen's *History*, Sir Frederick Pollock said, is the most extensive and arduous work undertaken by any English lawyer since the days of Blackstone, including many subjects interesting not only to the lawyer, but to the antiquary, the historian, and the moralist; it is the study of the growth of an organic structure, providing the data for the truly philosophical historian. His next publication was his *Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey*, an episode in the great drama in which Warren Hastings was the leading figure. It is a destructive analysis of Macaulay's famous essay, and did good service to real history by showing once for all the ruthlessness and extravagance of Macaulay's audacious rhetoric.

At last, in January, 1879, came his appointment as a judge of the High Court of Justice, "the Jerusalem of the Judiciary," the natural and proper aim and the fitting reward of a lifetime of legal study and preparation. His judicial career ended with his resignation in consequence of ill-health in 1891, and he died in 1894, after a gradual weakening of both mental and physical powers. It was sad to see the man whose intellectual force kept pace with a great and vigorous body slowly losing power, and the end was a release from enforced idleness hard for him to bear. Even when he was in the full tide of successful work on the Bench, his old journalistic impulse stirred within him, and he contributed to the *Times* a series of caustic letters on Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, from which he dissented with his whole strength. In these mature years he studied Spanish and read Cervantes, he mastered Italian and read Dante, and renewed his acquaintance, never a very intimate one, with the classics. He had a heavy blow in the death of his son, J. K. Stephen, whose career gave promise of great brilliancy, ending all too early in his thirty-third year. In this, as in all matters touching his home life, Mr. Leslie Stephen's biography of Sir J. F. Stephen is marked by a reticence that shows a profound respect for the sacredness of the family circle, while in his

criticism of his brother's literary work he speaks out plainly and strongly, thus lending greater weight to his account of it.

Much of the value of this *Life of Sir J. F. Stephen* is in showing that while he failed to secure the measure of success which his own honest ambition and the just estimate of his friends anticipated, yet he influenced other men in such a way as to make them strong and useful. His whole life was one of hard work, and he thoroughly enjoyed it for its own sake and not for any reward or honor that it might bring. His was a manly independence, of perhaps a little too rough a nature to commend him either to the people who had votes to give to a popular candidate for Parliament, or to the men in high office who had the power to give great places to those who served them with strong fidelity to party and unquestioning obedience. It was not in Stephen's nature to do this, — he thoughtfully reasoned out his own course in law, in politics, in theology, in metaphysics, and he was slow to change his views, but ready to confess his errors when he finally was convinced. Naturally such a man did not win university honors or gain a seat in Parliament or achieve great success at the Bar or popularity on the Bench, — indeed, he had for his personal comfort too little respect or regard for these or any conventional standards, — but he had a strong and manly nature, an intellectual superiority, an ambition to do good work, that made him a man of mark in his lifetime and that give his biography a special value of its own. Mr. Leslie Stephen's best qualities as a man of letters are shown in the capital way in which he has subordinated his own opinions and views of life, especially of intellectual life, in order to give to the world a clear and strong portrait of his brother, and we may be sure that his picture of Sir J. F. Stephen will be the one dearest to those who knew and loved the man, and to that larger circle of those who knew his work and respected its excellence.

J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

Wolfe. By A. G. BRADLEY. [English Men of Action.] (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. viii, 314.)

MR. BRADLEY has written an eminently readable book. The material for a biography of Wolfe is scanty, and already pretty well known through Wright's admirable *Life*. If we have now little that is new, the old story is retold with vigor and grace.

Wolfe's glory is the glory of one brilliant success, but he had the staying qualities of genius. Without money or powerful friends, he yet, even in Walpole's corrupt days, secured rapid promotion in the army by his own conspicuous merits. At twenty-two he was entrusted with the pacification of a whole district in Scotland. His genius was of the kind that takes infinite pains. His captains furnish him with an estimate of the characters of each of their men. Ill and worn-out at Quebec, he yet finds time and strength to visit two young subalterns lying ill on a transport.

of even his strong reasoning powers, yet he found or made opportunity to rewrite and recast his *History of the Criminal Law*, in which he put to practical use the historical methods of Maine and his school, to which Stephen came at last. The growth of the criminal law is closely connected with the development of the moral sense of the community, with all the great political and social revolutions, and with the changes of the ecclesiastical constitution and the religious belief of the nation. Almost unconsciously at first, but at last with a full recognition of the change, he had left the school of Bentham and Austin, and his *History of the Criminal Law* was complementary to the great constitutional histories of Hallam and Stubbs. He frankly acknowledged his obligations to them, but he made special investigations in his own field and produced a history of interest and value as bringing out certain correlative processes in the legal development of English institutions which constitutional histories naturally left in the background. He won the acknowledgment of very competent judges for his thorough mastery of the antiquities of the law, and yet it was a task not at all congenial to his love of general principles. Stephen's *History*, Sir Frederick Pollock said, is the most extensive and arduous work undertaken by any English lawyer since the days of Blackstone, including many subjects interesting not only to the lawyer, but to the antiquary, the historian, and the moralist; it is the study of the growth of an organic structure, providing the data for the truly philosophical historian. His next publication was his *Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey*, an episode in the great drama in which Warren Hastings was the leading figure. It is a destructive analysis of Macaulay's famous essay, and did good service to real history by showing once for all the ruthlessness and extravagance of Macaulay's audacious rhetoric.

At last, in January, 1879, came his appointment as a judge of the High Court of Justice, "the Jerusalem of the Judiciary," the natural and proper aim and the fitting reward of a lifetime of legal study and preparation. His judicial career ended with his resignation in consequence of ill-health in 1891, and he died in 1894, after a gradual weakening of both mental and physical powers. It was sad to see the man whose intellectual force kept pace with a great and vigorous body slowly losing power, and the end was a release from enforced idleness hard for him to bear. Even when he was in the full tide of successful work on the Bench, his old journalistic impulse stirred within him, and he contributed to the *Times* a series of caustic letters on Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, from which he dissented with his whole strength. In these mature years he studied Spanish and read Cervantes, he mastered Italian and read Dante, and renewed his acquaintance, never a very intimate one, with the classics. He had a heavy blow in the death of his son, J. K. Stephen, whose career gave promise of great brilliancy, ending all too early in his thirty-third year. In this, as in all matters touching his home life, Mr. Leslie Stephen's biography of Sir J. F. Stephen is marked by a reticence that shows a profound respect for the sacredness of the family circle, while in his

criticism of his brother's literary work he speaks out plainly and strongly, thus lending greater weight to his account of it.

Much of the value of this Life of Sir J. F. Stephen is in showing that while he failed to secure the measure of success which his own honest ambition and the just estimate of his friends anticipated, yet he influenced other men in such a way as to make them strong and useful. His whole life was one of hard work, and he thoroughly enjoyed it for its own sake and not for any reward or honor that it might bring. His was a manly independence, of perhaps a little too rough a nature to commend him either to the people who had votes to give to a popular candidate for Parliament, or to the men in high office who had the power to give great places to those who served them with strong fidelity to party and unquestioning obedience. It was not in Stephen's nature to do this, — he thoughtfully reasoned out his own course in law, in politics, in theology, in metaphysics, and he was slow to change his views, but ready to confess his errors when he finally was convinced. Naturally such a man did not win university honors or gain a seat in Parliament or achieve great success at the Bar or popularity on the Bench, — indeed, he had for his personal comfort too little respect or regard for these or any conventional standards, — but he had a strong and manly nature, an intellectual superiority, an ambition to do good work, that made him a man of mark in his lifetime and that give his biography a special value of its own. Mr. Leslie Stephen's best qualities as a man of letters are shown in the capital way in which he has subordinated his own opinions and views of life, especially of intellectual life, in order to give to the world a clear and strong portrait of his brother, and we may be sure that his picture of Sir J. F. Stephen will be the one dearest to those who knew and loved the man, and to that larger circle of those who knew his work and respected its excellence.

J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

Wolfe. By A. G. BRADLEY. [English Men of Action.] (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. viii, 314.)

MR. BRADLEY has written an eminently readable book. The material for a biography of Wolfe is scanty, and already pretty well known through Wright's admirable Life. If we have now little that is new, the old story is retold with vigor and grace.

Wolfe's glory is the glory of one brilliant success, but he had the staying qualities of genius. Without money or powerful friends, he yet, even in Walpole's corrupt days, secured rapid promotion in the army by his own conspicuous merits. At twenty-two he was entrusted with the pacification of a whole district in Scotland. His genius was of the kind that takes infinite pains. His captains furnish him with an estimate of the characters of each of their men. Ill and worn-out at Quebec, he yet finds time and strength to visit two young subalterns lying ill on a transport.

On his last field he found opportunity in the hurry of battle to seek out a wounded officer and promise promotion. With these qualities, which won the love of others, he was unwearied in self-improvement. At Glasgow he employs tutors from the University and is deep in mathematics and classics. He is an enthusiastic student of the art of war. His despatches are masterpieces. So good were they that it was whispered that Townshend, his highly educated brigadier, must have written them; but in time Townshend wrote poor despatches for himself. "If your brother," said George Selwyn to Charles Townshend, Pitt's successor at the War Office, "wrote Wolfe's despatches, who the devil wrote your brother's?" Wellington's despatches are masterpieces too, but Wolfe surpasses Wellington in scholarly tastes and dignity of character. Flip-pant oaths would have sounded incongruous on Wolfe's lips. We do not know what he could have done in strategy or tactics on a great European field. Dettingen was the only battle between disciplined forces that he saw, and he was then but sixteen. He fought at Culloden against wild Highlanders, and on the Plains of Abraham against regulars mingled with militia troops and Indians.

Mr. Bradley slips sometimes. It was not Horace, but Sir Robert, Walpole, who said, "They may ring their bells: they will soon be wringing their hands" (p. 9). The governor of Virginia was not always "titled" (p. 94). Canada in 1759 consisted of something more than scattered settlements stretching down the St. Lawrence from Montreal (p. 98). There were not "a mill, a mansion, and a church" on each seignior (p. 99). The churches were built as convenience prompted, and were generally less numerous than the seigniories. Louisbourg scarcely "commanded the mouth of the St. Lawrence" (p. 103). "The Canadas" did not exist until Upper Canada was established after the British Conquest (p. 141). On the other hand, one feels grateful to him for calling attention to an English archaism that the unwary would now call a new and vulgar Americanism. The sport was "elegant," says Wolfe of some grouse-shooting in Scotland.

The monument at Quebec which commemorates Wolfe and Montcalm with equal eulogy is probably unique. Recently, when a project was on foot in Canada to erect a memorial to some of the British who fell in the war with the United States in 1812-1815, Mr. Goldwin Smith offered to devote to the purpose the profits of his History of the United States, if an inscription in terms of international reconciliation were placed upon the monument.

This volume, like the others of the series, is crippled for want of an index.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States. By ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, D.D. ["American Church History" Series.] (New York: The Christian Literature Co. 1895. Pp. xxxi, 424.)

THE Rev. Robert Ellis Thompson, D.D., of Philadelphia, was selected by the Editorial Committee of the American Society of Church History, to write the history of the Presbyterian churches in the United States, for the series on "American Church History" which the Society planned, in the confidence that he could be trusted to present the facts in an impartial, scholarly, and interesting way. This confidence he has in the main justified.

The book opens with an excellent bibliography of fully 20 pages, distributed under periods. Similar bibliographies are given in each volume of the series, and constitute one of its most useful features. Then comes a single chapter on the historic antecedents, in the Old World, of the Presbyterian churches of the United States. To Calvin and John à Lasco Presbyterian polity is properly traced. From them it became the polity of the Reformed churches of the continent, and of the Scottish Church. But American Presbyterianism is really derived from Ulster, whither Scottish Presbyterians had emigrated in large numbers, in the early part of the seventeenth century, and whence they were driven to this country by prelatical oppression and troublesome landlords. The founder of American Presbyterianism is the Rev. Francis Makemie, who landed in 1683, and in Philadelphia was moderator of the first presbytery in 1705. Immigration from Ulster to America began in the closing decades of the seventeenth century, and set in on a great scale in the eighteenth century. As there were several species of Presbyterianism in the old country, it is not to be wondered at that the imported at once showed these varieties. Presbyterians were fond of argumentation upon small points, and so they divided among themselves on the old lines, and later on new ones. To-day, although much consolidation has taken place, and there has been a marked falling off of polemical zeal, there are still four distinct varieties of Presbyterianism among us, viz. the Presbyterian Church, *par excellence*, North and South, the Cumberland Presbyterians, the United Presbyterians, and the Reformed Presbyterians. They stand in this order in influence, numbers, wealth, and prospects, and there are few signs that these bodies will unite. Dr. Thompson tells the story of the growth of these species, giving much the larger space, properly, to the great Presbyterian Church, North and South. But in trying to follow several lines of development, he occasionally gets the skeins a little tangled and the reader's attention is distracted.

How modern the book is, is seen by the chapters on the Briggs and Smith cases, and that on the proposed Theological Seminary control. Probably many will turn to see what the author has to say upon the Briggs matter, and some will be surprised at his strictures upon the General

Assembly's decision. He frees his mind in fine style, and, perhaps, goes too far in his remarks. "This decision," he says (p. 269), "lacks the calm of the judicial temper. It is pervaded by a personal animus, which finds an outlet in many of its phrases, and especially in the conversion of the charge of unsound teaching into one of personal immorality, and in making the restoration of the offender dependent not upon the retraction of his alleged errors, but upon his 'repentance' for his sin. It thus affixes a stigma to the accused, which was not warranted by any evidence before the Assembly, nor embodied in any of the charges on which he was tried." Another chapter full of frank criticism is on Presbyterian theological and literary life since 1870. He scatters praise and condemnation with a free hand upon the writers and teachers of the Church, mentioning the living as well as the dead.

Dr. Thompson found the 450 pages allowed by the publisher for the volume all too many, and used only 316. He thus had space for an appendix of 100 pages of the most important documents "illustrative of the history of the Presbyterian Church in America." As this list is itself an epitome of Presbyterian history, and as nowhere else can the student find these documents all brought together in so convenient a form, his list will be here given entire: 1. The Scottish National Covenant of 1581; 2. The Solemn League and Covenant, 1643; 3. The Adopting Acts of 1647; 4. The Adopting Act of the Synod of Philadelphia, 1729; 5. The Synod of Philadelphia's Explanatory Act of 1736; 6. The Protestation of 1741, which occasioned the division of the Synod of Philadelphia; 7. The Plan of Union of 1758; 8. The Basis of Union of 1782, on which the Associate Reformed Church was founded; 9. The Adopting Acts of 1788; 10. The Declaration of Principles of 1788; 11. The Terms of Subscription required of Candidates for Ordination in the Presbyterian Church since 1788; 12. The Plan of Union of 1801; 13. The Excinding Acts of 1837; 14. The Auburn Declaration of 1837; 15. Deliverances on Slavery [in the various Presbyterian churches]; 16. Doctrinal Basis of the Union of 1858, forming the United Presbyterian Church; 17. Adopting Act of the Union of 1858; 18. The Action of the Old School Assembly on Loyalty, in 1861; 19. Address of the Southern General Assembly to all the Churches of Jesus Christ, adopted 1861 [one of the most remarkable papers in American history, and which should by all means be read by every Northern man]; 20. Doctrinal Basis of Union of the United Synod of the South (N.S.) with the Southern Presbyterian Church (O.S.), 1864; 21. The Doctrinal Basis of the Reunion of the Old and the New School Churches in 1869; 22. The Concurrent Declarations of 1869; 23. The Charges upon which Dr. Briggs was tried, and the Sentence pronounced by the General Assembly, 1893; 24. Proposed Plan for the Federation of the Reformed Churches of America, 1894.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

The Finances of the United States from 1775 to 1789, with Especial Reference to the Budget. By CHARLES J. BULLOCK. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin: Economics, Political Science, and History Series, Vol. I., No. 2.] (Madison: The University, 1895. Pp. 157.)

THE monograph before us is one more reminder that the period of blind worship of everything belonging to the era of our Revolution is ended. It is, also, proof that we are reaching the stage of true university work. The idea that our institutions are not an invention, but a growth, is beginning to take root. To within a very recent time, it was supposed that the revolutionary fathers evolved out of their inner consciousness all that we now have, and that, too, in a perfected state.

This essay, as well as those of Robinson, Guggenheimer, and many others, indicates that unthinking laudation of all things American is to be relegated to campaign speeches. It also gives evidence that we have reached that intellectual maturity which enables us to trace the unfolding of our institutions from small and imperfect beginnings, and to test them, not by our reverence for the men of a past century, but by their adaptability to the needs of the complex civilization of which we are a part. Forsaking the generalities of a previous generation, students are now content to take each a small portion of the system established a century ago and trace its origin and growth.

One result of this new method has been to call attention to the necessity of a new classification of what may be called the social sciences. For instance, it would be extremely difficult to say whether the work of Mr. Bullock is a study in history, in public finance, or in administration.

The introduction to the essay gives a general view of the condition of affairs at the outbreak of the Revolution. The remainder of the work falls naturally into two parts, and the "Conclusions." Part I. gives a detailed account of the income and expenditure of the United Colonies. The revenues are described according to their origin, as those from (1) Continental paper currency, (2) domestic and foreign loans, (3) taxes, and (4) miscellaneous. This is followed by a careful estimate of the expenditures.

Part II., which deals with the finances from an administrative standpoint, is by far the most interesting portion of the work. The first chapter gives a chronological account of the various acts, committees, officers, and boards by means of which Congress collected and disbursed the national revenues. The next chapter traces historically the development of the idea of a budget. Then comes a minute account of the steps by which Congress came to the idea of a reasonably unified budget in 1789.

Traces of the popular prejudice of which we have spoken are revealed in the author's repeated attempts to prove that none of our ideas of a budget came from Great Britain, but from the practices of the individual provinces. It is doubtful if the point is well taken. Be that as it may,

to be consistent, the author should have proved in turn that none of the individual colonies followed precedents from the mother country.

The monograph throws much new light on the real nature of the confederation, and shows the inherent weakness of that form of government. The lack of executive and judicial power during those important years not only prevented the development of a good financial administration and left its traces upon the Constitution of 1789, but also influenced, in a marked degree, the later practices under that constitution. The work is completed by a careful *résumé* of the ground covered by the essay, and a list of the works used in preparing it.

Among the more important things emphasized by the author are the facts, first, that a lack of taxing power led inevitably to dependence on bills of credit and that the ease with which these could be issued prevented any feeling of responsibility for a budget in which income and expenditure were balanced; and, second, that a people accustomed for almost twenty years to a government which had no power to tax, naturally demanded an exemption from direct taxes under our present more liberal constitution. The result of this is our great dependence on indirect taxation to this day.

On the whole, the essay is a careful, conscientious, successful piece of work, and a contribution to our knowledge of this very critical period of our national life.

A little more care in proof-reading (for a single example see line 4, page 234) would have made the volume much more attractive in appearance.

JOHN H. GRAY.

Life and Correspondence of Rufus King. Edited by his grandson, CHARLES R. KING. Vol. II., 1795-1799. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1895. Pp. 666.)

A NUMBER of characteristics make the *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King* one of the most valuable contributions to the early history of the United States. The man was notable because of many high qualities and wide experience in public life. Without the constructive brilliancy of Hamilton, or the destructive capacity of Jefferson, or the critical ability of Madison, King deservedly takes a high rank as a man of action, trained intelligence, and great common sense. The contrast between Monroe's diplomatic failure in France and King's success in England illustrates the strength of the latter. Monroe was misled by his sympathies, and at a critical juncture permitted his feelings to govern his head. The result was a serious menace to the safety of the newly constituted United States, and this overzealous agent was properly disgraced. With quite as delicate questions to manage, and with sentimental predispositions quite as strong, King succeeded in everything he attempted, and in everything left the impress of a clear and far-sighted statesman. This

was due, in great part, to his training and associations. A lawyer by profession, he had served in the Continental Congress before that body had sunk into contempt and lost all power of submitting recommendations acceptable to the states. His labors in the Constitutional Convention trained his political sense, and a long term in the Federal Senate, during a critical period of domestic policy, brought him into close association with the leading men of the day, whose influence he felt and reflected.

The second volume of this correspondence covers a part of his services in the Senate and in London. Much of the purely official interchange of despatches between King and the Department of State has been published in the State Papers; but that often meagre and formal record is supplemented by his private correspondence, now printed for the first time. The value and interest of these letters it would be difficult to exaggerate. The free expressions of such men as Gore, Cabot, Sedgwick, Troup, and Noah Webster, on political thought and intrigue, are historical records, all the more valuable because brought together in one volume. In describing the passing phases of party movements, they throw light on public policy and individual motives. The questions of neutrality, citizenship, impressments, commercial systems and treaties, French and English depredations on American commerce, the progress of French conquests and the rise of Napoleon, the rebellion in Ireland, the uprising of Toussaint, and the attitude of the United States to possible republics in South America and the West Indies—these are a few of the matters touched upon in these letters, and always in a serious and thoughtful tone.

His position in England made heavy demands upon King's judgment, and it is remarkable in how many directions the United States could have been closely associated with Great Britain in her far-reaching schemes. England proposes joint action in the formation of independent republics in South America, and sees in them a means of checking the French advance towards any foothold in America. Some combined interference is also suggested in Toussaint's plans, for a free black power in the West Indies would be a menace to British islands and to the continuance of slavery in the Southern States. Pitt proposes that the United States and England form a "combine" in sugar, and, possibly, in coffee; for the trade in those articles was monopolized by the two countries. King favors a treaty of commerce with the Porte, and England and Russia proffer their good offices and influence in the matter. France is all for gain, and having forced the United States to denounce existing treaties with her, preys upon its commerce, rejects its ministers, and refuses to negotiate without bribes even more immoral than the piracies of the Barbary States. Through an American (Vans Murray), France makes advances to England for a hearing and possible diplomatic intercourse. It would be easy to extend this list of subjects; it would be interesting to quote King's opinions; but the letters must be studied to be appreciated at their real value.

They leave the impression of unusual merit. The editing by Dr. Charles R. King is judicious, accurate, and praiseworthy for its reserve.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

The Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike, to Headwaters of the Mississippi River, through Louisiana Territory, and in New Spain, during the Years 1805-6-7. A new edition, now first reprinted in full from the original of 1810, with copious critical commentary, memoir of Pike, new map and other illustrations, and complete index. By ELLIOTT COUES, late Captain and Assistant Surgeon, United States Army; late Secretary and Naturalist, United States Geological Survey. (New York: Francis P. Harper. Three vols., pp. cxiii, 955.)

In March, 1804, the trans-Mississippi domain of Spain was delivered over to the United States. In August of the year following Lieutenant Pike, at the head of twenty soldiers, was despatched from St. Louis to the sources of the Mississippi. At Prairie du Chien, — the only white village on his route, — he met, in council, the Chippewas, urged them to expel whiskey-sellers, and induced them to turn back from the war-path on which they had entered against the Sioux. At the Falls of St. Anthony he bought of Indians a site he had selected for a fort, sealing the contract with sixty gallons of whiskey. At Little Falls, not far south of the line of the Northern Pacific Railroad, he built a stockade and left in it seven of his command. With the rest, each four of his men drawing a sled, he pushed on to a British Fur Company's establishment on Sandy Lake, thence to another on Leech Lake, where he arrived on the 1st of February, 1806. This water he viewed, and rightly, as "the main [that is, most voluminous] source of the Mississippi." But he advanced thirty miles further north to Cass Lake.

He extorted from natives divers British medals, made British fur-traders promise that they would give them no more, and would themselves pay duties on the goods they had hitherto smuggled. On the last of April Pike and his party had descended the river and were in the camp which had been their starting-point.

Ten weeks later Pike set forth on another expedition. Its primary object was restoring to the Osages, on their great river, some fifty Osage captives redeemed by our government from Indian foes. Thence he went north to the Republican River in Nebraska, then south to the Arkansas and up it till his way was hedged up by the Royal Gorge. Turning northwest, he discovered and measured the peak that bears his name, and came upon a watercourse which he thought the Red River, but which, as he at last learned, was in fact the Arkansas. Going southward, he struck the Rio del Norte, which he believed, or said that he believed, to be the Red River. Captured by Spaniards, he was carried as a mysterious personage to Santa Fé, to Chihuahua, the provincial capital,

and at the end of four months, chiefly consumed in sluggish marches, he was escorted to the American line near Natchitoches, by a Spanish Dogberry who, doubtless, "called his watch together and thanked God that they were rid of a knave."

Pike's hairbreadth escapes from the Spanish lion, at an explosion of powder, at the burning of his tent, among hostile Indians, in cold and nakedness, above all from perils of wilderness starvation, were beyond anything save his own description. In the event of war with Spain, which was imminent, his Mexican disclosures would have been invaluable, and must have raised him at once from a captain to a general.

He had kept a daily journal even when the ink froze in his pen — and it had eluded Spanish detectives, being at last hidden in the barrels of his soldiers' guns. Each of his journeys was in a *terra incognita*, and yet one about which curiosity was keen. His first edition, of 1810, naturally found a warm welcome both abroad and at home. Nor is his work of ephemeral interest. The observations of an intelligent man in a virgin field never are. Witness the perennial popularity of Xenophon's *Anabasis*. But his writings have a tenfold charm for dwellers on the upper Mississippi and the vast Southwest.

Anticipating the curiosity that myriads must feel in their cradle era, Dr. Coues has brought out a new edition of a book well worthy of his pains. His qualifications for this labor are not likely to be again united in any single man. He has himself seen almost every scene described by Pike, in many quarters while himself serving in the army. He has made many special pilgrimages on land and water for rounding out his Pikean research. He has written in Washington and known how to cull from its archives side-lights for the obscurities of his author. He has taxed all the world that his production may lack no fulness of perfection.

But here alas, the defect — say rather the excess of his qualities. He claims to have made a reference edition of Pike. He has, but he should have left his readers to make more references for themselves. "Half is more than the whole" is as true a maxim to-day as when Hesiod declared those unwise who did not know it. No matter what store of learning or vivacity of expression, a big book is a big bore.

Pike's expeditions north and south, even with the York campaign in which he perished thrown in, did not fill two years. Now that they are blazoned in three octavos and 1068 pages, in the embarrassment of riches we feel like the child who was happy with his present of an orange in each hand, but when a third was offered him burst into tears. He had no third hand.

The new Pike has outgrown its girdle and yet it might have been easily put into circumscription and confine. There seems to have been an original sin in its make-up, — namely, an endeavor to produce tomes that would approximate in ponderosity and price to the author's Lewis and Clark. But in treating of those worthies there was constant occasion to correct, complete, or illustrate the text of the former editor from the

manuscript codices of the captains. Hence there was need of a thousand notes, while among half as many on Pike not a few are dead weight like the stone a Turkish muleteer puts in one side of his pannier to balance the load. Biographical sketches, in scores, of persons, both civil and military, whose connection, if any, with Pike was of the slightest, should have been omitted, or condensed from pages to lines.

Dr. Coues has done well in giving within brackets the scientific names of plants, animals, etc., mentioned by Pike, but his further explanations are to the average reader often *obscurum per obscurius*. A specimen is the definition of wild-rice (p. 39), too long to quote, which is a parallel to Johnson's saying that network is "anything reticulated or decussated with interstices at the intersections." After one brief note the editor says, "For the rest see any cyclopædia or gazetteer" (p. 32). He should have said so many times, — or rather his readers would have known enough to consult these and other reference books for themselves. They could look in Webster for "wind-shake" (p. 109) as well as he. Brevity, the soul of wit, would have made a desirable gain had we been spared eight pages of legal quibbles concerning the purchase of a site for Fort Snelling (p. 232) and about as many regarding the Mexican boundary and "places near it of which Pike had nothing to say" (p. 642). Several pages in proof that Pike had more than one child need not have been printed, if five words had been quoted from a letter which Wilkinson wrote him; namely, "Your *children* have been indisposed" (p. 576). It is hard to see reason for several lists of stations from railroad guides, and extracts from the exaggerations of booming towns, as where St. Paul is credited with a population of 190,000 (p. 92) [140,292 was the census of 1895].

But none of the multitudinous notes need expurgation so much as those throwing out sceptical sneers which are as much out of place as a Sabbatarian's censures on Pike's Sunday travel would have been. Thus, Pike wrote two lines in mention of an Indian deluge myth (p. 180). Coues adds thirty-six longer lines to proclaim his own disbelief in "the Noachian narration." Pike one day read Volney (p. 154). Why should Coues fill five and twenty lines with a eulogy on Volney? He must have thought he needed whitewashing. In stating that, as he thinks, the St. Croix River was not so named from the Christian cross, he talks of "the theological proclivity to suppose the name to have been given for the usual instrument of the execution of Roman malefactors, later put by the Emperor Constantine on his banner, and afterward used for other purposes" (p. 71). On the next leaf he calls an Indian burying-ground "the sacred spot hallowed by association with the deepest religious emotions of the aborigines" (p. 73). "Look on this picture, and on this!" What need to shock Catholics and Protestants alike? "This sin's not accidental, but a trade."

In cases such as we have noticed it seems a pity that Dr. Coues did not "allay his skipping spirit with some cold drops of modesty." For detailed criticisms we have no room, nor is there much need. In one

linguistic remark, however, he seems at fault. Bostonians, as an Indian name for English-speaking Americans, he traces to Lake Superior. Finding it in the Chinook of the northwest coast, he infers that "it passed from mouth to mouth across the continent" (p. 188). More probably it came round Cape Horn, and was the name by which tribes on the Columbia knew the Boston-men who discovered that river in 1792. So an army officer, more than forty years ago stationed at Fort Vancouver, assured the writer. The longest way round, the shortest way there.

On the whole, the new Pike must prove monumental. It will forever link its author with Pike's fame. Its map of Mississippi sources, and the arduous voyage into the farthest fountains, will not let us wonder that the Minnesota State Park Commissioner styled a lakelet feeding Itasca Elliott Coues, and inscribed that name upon a boulder on that utmost shore.

JAMES DAVIE BUTLER.

The First Chapter of Norwegian Immigration (1821-1840). Its Causes and Results. With an Introduction on the Services rendered by the Scandinavians to the World and to America. By RASMUS B. ANDERSON, LL.D. (Madison, Wis.: The Author. 1896. Pp. xvi, 469.)

DURING the first two centuries after the English occupation of America, scarcely any Norwegians settled here; such few as visited these shores were, so far as anything is known about them, mostly sailors. It was in 1825 that the first body of Norwegian colonists — fifty-three in number — landed in New York harbor. What had influenced them to leave their native land was, it would appear, largely dissent from the State Church, most of these immigrants being Quakers. They founded a settlement in Orleans County, New York, where some of their descendants still live. Some years later others came, and in greater numbers, mostly with a view to improving their material condition. These generally went to the West, where, by 1840, five considerable settlements had been established. Many were the hardships they endured, prosaic was often the life they led, and scant was as yet the measure of religious comfort they enjoyed.

Such, in brief, is the story that Mr. Anderson relates in this volume. That the story is worth the telling admits of no doubt, especially in view of the broader stream of Norwegian immigration which began to pour in upon and enrich the Northwest in subsequent years. The historian who would determine the influences that go to the making of American character must reckon with contributions of this kind. They are more than mere local history; they are records of people developing some of their better race-characteristics through struggles with new difficulties. For inquiring into the antecedents of Norwegian-Americans, Mr. Anderson has peculiar facilities, and to the inquiry he has devoted much time and pains. The result is a collection of much interesting information that will

prove especially valuable to historical investigators in a broader field. But as the author himself admits, arrangement and proportion are sometimes faulty. This is in part due to the nature of the materials that had to be dealt with. Yet it would seem that more success in these respects was attainable. The biographic and genealogical details in which the book abounds have, no doubt, their interest, but it is questionable whether so many names should have been introduced into a work intended, I take it, as a contribution to history. The general reader would have been thankful for a fuller account of pioneer life, and to that end would willingly have dispensed with the full text of some of the letters of reminiscences addressed to the author. As it is, the book lacks somewhat in unity and in literary finish.

In his introduction Mr. Anderson seems to strain matters somewhat to make out a strong case for the old vikings. This was not necessary. Nor can Leif Erikson properly be said to have contributed anything to America — unless it be the mooted question as to where he landed. Until we know to a certainty that Columbus profited by the Norse discovery, that discovery, while an important event in Norse history, will to America possess only an antiquarian interest.

ANDREW ESTREM.

History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850. By JAMES FORD RHODES. Vols. I.—III.; 1850–1862. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1893–1895. Pp. 506, 541, 659.)

MR. RHODES has entered upon the task of writing the history of the United States from 1850 to 1885. The first two volumes of the work were published two years ago and were almost universally commended. Students of American history were delighted to find that one had begun this work who appreciated the dignity and difficulty of the undertaking, and who combined many of the qualities called for in a great historian; for the period presents many difficulties and calls for talent of a peculiar order. He who could piece together with patience and imagination the scattered bits that form the groundwork of mediæval history might well stand aghast before the tons of material that must needs be scanned before one can pass a final judgment upon the Rebellion and the era of reconstruction. Moreover, the years are yet new. No one, North or South, can read of Manassas or Shiloh without a tendency to a quicker pulse; and only supernatural genius will allow an American to write a purely objective history of that "mightiest struggle and most glorious victory as yet recorded in human annals." It is not too much to say that Mr. Rhodes has succeeded remarkably well in overcoming the two difficulties just mentioned. He has shown unusual skill in handling redundant or conflicting testimony; and he has shown himself a historian and not a partisan. In the first respect he has perhaps given a lesson to future writers of history. For the newspaper has become the great problem to the

historian. How can one sift the gold from the dross? Its kernels of truth are apt to be like Gratiano's reasons, "as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff; you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you find them they are not worth the search." Mr. Rhodes has successfully solved the problem. He does not delve in the chaff of thousands of papers or hold up to view treasure-trove from innumerable pamphlets. A newspaper, like any other witness, is forced to show its worth and standing before its words are taken seriously; moreover, he does not forget that reports and editorials are written by men, and he strives to get behind the printed page to the man that wrote the words. Greeley and Weed are to him thoughtful and influential persons, but they are not crowned deities because they control the utterances of big newspapers. It is not the transient newsmonger of Washington whom he trusts, but the accredited correspondent who has shown acumen, ability, and sense. Facts are not gleaned from the press when less sensational sources can be discovered; but references are continually made to newspapers and periodicals to show apparent public sentiment or the drift of public opinion. He has thus shown us how the history of our day can be written. To cut oneself loose from the daily press is to deny oneself access to the life of the people. But to cull from the irresponsible sensational sheet all the vivid imaginings of worthless reporters is to portray life as a fiery furnace, through which one can pass unscathed only when clothed in the garments of *Abed-nego*. By this sensible use of material Mr. Rhodes has given a picture of stirring events without making the reader feel that the world had left its orbit. For through all these momentous years men bought and sold, planted and reaped, married and were given in marriage.

In avoidance of partisanship and palpable advocacy, Mr. Rhodes has shown talent. The books are utterly free from vituperation or sectional spitefulness. There is a conscientious effort to be impassively scientific. Possibly the next century will see a fairer treatment, but we have no right to expect that in this generation a book will be written more free from passion and prejudice. Some may doubt if the historian is called upon to be as inflexible as the physical scientist. There has always been place for moral indignation in the affairs of men, and the great historian will probably always feel a touch of it, because without strong human feeling he cannot fully appreciate the impulses of which he writes. These books occasionally give evidence of such weakness—or strength—as strong sympathy or deep personal interest; but it is not the reviewer's duty to rebuke the author for such fault or to bid him be bloodless in all he writes. He certainly has not forgotten that the South was the victim of heredity and environment, and under the influence of climate and cotton. Science has helped him to leniency of judgment. Yet, dispassionate as the author is on the whole, he is not weak in his opinions or estimates of men. Buchanan, for example, is not maligned. He is not described by a single noxious epithet. But the utter incompetence of the

"old maid," as Polk rightly dubbed him, appears on every page simply from the calm recital of events and the plain picturing of the situation. It is extremely interesting to see how all the special pleading that had been done in Buchanan's behalf loses force and color in the light of unadorned facts.

The third volume, which has just issued from the press, will not disappoint the expectations raised by the earlier volumes. In independence of thought and in careful and adroit handling of perplexing events, this third volume is the best of all. The reader is at no time befogged. The intricacies of the winter of 1860-1861 are dealt with so skilfully that the knotted skein is all untangled. This result is due to two causes. The writer has firmly grasped the main facts and clearly stated them, unencumbered with philosophy and undimmed by moral reflections or argument; he has, moreover, written with utmost clearness. The style now and again becomes monotonous; it is never brilliant, but it is always simple, direct, effective. Occasionally there is a piece of strong description, — made stronger by the simplicity of the language. The scenes in Charleston when the Ordinance of Secession was adopted are given vividly and make a deep impression; and yet through it all the style is not turgid, but quiet, retiring, as if an awestruck spectator were in no mood for rhetorical flowers or fireworks. The author has found his greatest task in choosing illustrative material for his footnotes. It is well that he is not suffering from the reaction which seems to have set in against copious references and annotations. But beyond question he should have had a little more courage and stricken out quotations not really illustrative of the text, even though they are interesting in themselves. At times, to use an old figure, there is only a rivulet of text running through a meadow of notes.

Occasionally Mr. Rhodes seems to lack decision. The judicial spirit seems to have overpowered his judgment. He hesitates, for instance, to determine whether it were better for the North to fight, or once again to compromise in hopes of a peaceful issue from the irrepressible conflict. Perhaps it is not the historian's business to decide such questions, or to indulge in *ex post facto* prophecy; he soon finds that past events were hurried along by inevitable causes springing from innumerable sources, and that the task of prophesying from hypothetical conditions is a thankless one for the simple reason that such conditions were impossible. The author closes his eyes to the full force of the resolution which McLean of New York offered on the peace conference: "Whenever a party shall be beaten in an election for president or vice-president, such party may rebel and take up arms, and, unless the successful shall adopt as its own the principles of the defeated party, and consent to such amendments to the constitution as the latter party shall dictate, then, in such case, the Union shall be at an end." These resolutions contain the essence of the contest. There is no occasion now, even though we know the horror and anguish of civil war, to doubt that the North would have been craven had it yielded to such conditions. It would have destroyed

the very foundations of free government. There are times when it is necessary to fight, and Chandler was not far wrong when he said that without a little blood-letting "this Union will not . . . be worth a rush." Such indecision and hesitation as the author occasionally exhibits are, after all, not serious blemishes on his work. It is refreshing to find a writer making no assumption of infallibility. He is ever anxious to show the reader the grounds for his faith or doubt. He is willing to admit that in many matters of real history, when a historian is portraying the vicissitudes of a great people's life, the play of motive and the impulses of passion are difficult to detect, and he who would seek a nation's stops must approach his task without assurance or conceit.

In this third volume Mr. Rhodes discusses at some length the efforts at compromise in the winter of 1860-1861. He directs attention almost entirely to the Senate. The House committee of thirty-three is scarcely mentioned. The Peace Congress receives little more than passing notice. The words and conduct of Seward are examined with care, and the votes of the Senate committee are carefully analyzed. In other books we have had our eyes directed to the presumption of the South, to the folly of efforts to soothe away insolvable troubles, or to the weakness of the North, overcome with reactionary remorse. Mr. Rhodes has given us a different view. Possibly he does not estimate aright the inflexible purpose of the South to have all or nothing, and yet he seems to make it pretty clear that the failure of compromise measures was due to the stalwart Republicans, to those whom Chandler called "stiff-backed men." Seward, the most influential man of all, was at first hesitating, fearful. Had Seward, and he alone, taken his stand for the Crittenden compromise, the plan might have been adopted and the line 36° 30' run through to California. To Lincoln is due the fact that Seward held firm and came to see that a compromise, that yielded the principle for which his party had striven, could not be acquiesced in. But, spite of the acumen and insight with which Mr. Rhodes has examined this matter, he sees in one respect not quite clearly. His eyes are directed so assiduously to the metropolitan newspapers, to the fluctuations of opinion in mart and street of the great cities, that he seems to forget that behind all this was a mighty folk and that "the plain people" were not willing to surrender and call their action compromise. Lincoln's position was only one more illustration of the fact that he felt for and with the people about him. Even in the East, the young men, free from traditional conservatism and not yet tainted by commercial instinct, were far more apt to be uncompromising than the more prominent men who controlled the newspapers or stood at the head of great factories. It is clear that the West, not bound by cotton ties to the South, was unflinchingly devoted to the party to which it had given birth. Not Seward or Greeley or Weed, but Wade and Lincoln and Chandler, were the stiff-backed men of the crisis. A fuller study of Western sources would, it seems to me, have enabled the author to detect more surely the strong and conquering forces of the time.

Mr. Rhodes has given us neither a constitutional nor a military history. Constitutional questions have no attractions for him. He utterly refuses to assume the legalistic attitude. He does well not to entangle himself in senseless subtleties; but, after all, even the Rebellion took its rise in legal argument and its assumed justification in constitutional construction, and the conduct of the war involved many legal difficulties. These volumes would have been richer if the author had not avoided all legal problems in his endeavor to shun legalism. One wonders how he will succeed in dealing with the reconstruction period; for there law and fiction of law are the very Hamlet and Horatio of the whole drama. His account of military affairs, too, is somewhat meagre. Whatever he has to say is said lucidly and well. But there are certain indications of a distaste for military history. He has no zest for the game of war, and thus he loses sight of the broad and interesting strategic problems which make of war a huge game of chess. He lacks the geographic sense which enables a writer to see a military situation and to put it graphically, that sense which made Grant a general and his book a masterpiece. Without this power one cannot be a good military historian. It is well that the author has realized his limitations, for what he attempts to do he does well. He is writing a political and social history with rare judgment, accuracy, and patience, with good literary skill, and with sincerity and honesty of purpose. It bids fair to take its place among the very best works of American authors.

A. C. McLAUGHLIN.

The Canadian Banking System, 1817-1890. By ROELIFF MORTON BRECKENRIDGE, Ph.D., sometime Seligman Fellow in Economics, Columbia College. (New York: Published for the American Economic Association, by Macmillan and Co., 1895. Pp. 476.)

THIS octavo of 476 pages is accounted as the equivalent of three ordinary numbers of the publications of the American Economic Association, and is distributed to the members as Nos. 1, 2, and 3, of Vol. X. The importance of the subject, and the skill displayed in its treatment, fully justify the concession of so much space.

The United States banking system has maintained a deserved popularity for more than thirty years for a double reason. First, the system embodied the results of the best American banking experience; second, it has been operated under an environment of favoring conditions. But of late these circumstances have not been so favorable, and it is well understood in financial circles that the excellent principles of the national system must have a new application to changed conditions if it is to survive. The "Baltimore plan" of the Bankers' Association is an example of the various projects brought forward for its amendment.

Wise conservatism should always prevail in monetary legislation, and

a suitable period of education should precede any radical action in a matter so important as a national banking system. The experience of any foreign nation with a banking system should, at this time, be welcome and useful, but that of a state so similar to our own as is the Dominion of Canada, in geographic location and features, in its history and people, ought especially to yield valuable lessons and precedents.

Mr. Breckenridge's work is very opportune, and should be carefully examined by every one who expects to act, or to influence action, upon any feature of our monetary system. The only persons who cannot be benefited by such works are those extremists who hold and teach that banks should have no place in a monetary system, but that the government should have the monopoly not only of coinage, but of the issue of paper money. With such the author has not thought fit, in this historical work, to reckon, and he was under no obligation to do so.

The first half of the volume is given up to the history of the rise of Canadian banking from 1817, and its progress up to the formation of the confederation in 1867. The busy reader may skim the first six chapters but lightly, especially if he has lately read the excellent sketch by Mr. Walker in Palgrave's *Dictionary of Political Economy*, or that of Mr. Hague in *Canadian Economics*, a volume made up of papers read before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at its Montreal meeting in 1884. Chapters VII., VIII., and IX. carry on the history of Canadian banking as organized under the first Dominion law of 1871, as amended in that of 1881, and as it was finally, in 1890, revised and codified in the admirable legislation of that year.

The transfer of the control of banking from provincial to Dominion authority wrought no revolution in the principles of the system. Just as the national government of the United States took over the New York banking system, so the Dominion upon its organization followed in its legislation that of a leading province. Mr. Breckenridge's final chapter (X.) is devoted to a not uncritical, but still highly commendatory, discussion of the working of the system as finally established in 1890. It ought, probably, to be assumed that the author's approval of the leading features of the system applies to it as a system for Canada as she is and has come to be, and that he does not expect those features to be generally adopted in other neighboring jurisdictions. The concentration of the banking business into the hands of a few corporations domiciled in the great cities would not now, if ever, be tolerated in the United States, no matter how great might be the promised advantage to the public. Our idea of local government and independence would equally prevent the establishment of any system of branch banking under the control of such great central corporations. In regard to the practical management of banking business, much may be learned from the Canadians by those who know how to learn from the experience of other people. While Scotch and English customs and traditions prevail, our neighbors have not neglected to adopt American ideas and devices. The American plan of a note circulation,

founded on securities, however, the Canadians, after ample consideration, rejected. They prefer to adhere to their traditional policy of a bank circulation resting solely on the credit of the banking corporations, under safeguards of law. No reserve is required, and no definite securities are pledged, but the notes are made a first lien on all the assets of a failing bank. That such a circulation has been successfully operated for many years to the profit of the banks and the public convenience, without the least loss to note-holders, is a matter of history. That it possesses the capital advantage of elasticity is well shown in this book. Just here is the weak spot in our American monetary system in its present condition. Since the repeal of the "Sherman Act" there has been absolutely no elastic element left in our circulation, a state of things which must, before long, become intolerable. The critical reader will note in this book, now and then, a crudity of expression natural to an unpractised writer, which will, no doubt, trouble the author more than any one else.

WILLIAM W. FOLWELL.

The Arnold Prize Essay for 1894 was a monograph on *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, by B. L. Abrahams, which is now issued as a thin book (Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 83 pp.). The treatise is an interesting and valuable one, based on varied and careful research. Mr. Abrahams treats the history of the Jews in England from the Conqueror's time, but especially in the thirteenth century. He shows how the economic policy of the towns closed to the Jews other careers than that of the money-lender, and how the increase of popular hostility towards them was accompanied by the decrease of their financial importance to the Crown, until, under the influence of the decrees of the Council of Lyons, Edward I., in 1275, forbade them the pursuit of usury. He exhibits the efforts of the king toward a statesmanlike policy with relation to his Jews, and the mode in which that effort was made vain by their isolation, at once compulsory and voluntary. The motives and events which led to the final act of expulsion are set forth, together with its execution and results.

Mr. Irving B. Richman, Consul-General of the United States in Switzerland, residing at St. Gallen, has published a small book on a neighboring state, the interesting little half-canton of Appenzell Innere Rhoden, — *Appenzell; Pure Democracy and Pastoral Life in Inner-Rhoden; a Swiss Study* (London and New York, Longmans, 206 pp.). The portion of the book devoted to the history of the canton, somewhat less than a half, gives a plain, intelligible, and interesting account of its development from Roman times to the present century. The author's conclusions on the questions of primitive property and primitive democracy, so far as they are illustrated by Inner Appenzell, are of interest: "In what has been said it is not intended to advance the proposition that in

Inner-Rhoden the Mark, in all its technical features, was a primary institution. It is not intended to assert that, technically, there was not overlordship, or that private property did not exist. The proposition which is advanced is, that there must have been in this region, primarily, a considerable number of persons practically freemen, and that the Almend of to-day, with its tincture of communism, not improbably points to a yet more communistic and autonomous Almend in the past."

The ardent, almost passionate, study of the career of Napoleon, which forms the most characteristic incident of recent historical research, but which has been rather popular and hero-worshipping than scientific, has extended itself to all whose lives in any way touched or influenced the famous Corsican adventurer. The beautiful creole who filled so large a part in the private life of the Emperor has of course come in for her share of adulation. The latest book devoted to her is the production of Mr. Frederick A. Ober (*Josephine Empress of the French*, New York, The Merriam Company, 1895, pp. vi, 458), who is better known as a traveller in the West Indies with a charming gift of description than as a historian. It may be said at once that his book is historically worthless; it is a mere rhapsody of admiration, interspersed with attacks on Josephine's detractors, and reads more like a volume of devotions in honor of a saint than a sober biography. Now all the eloquence in the world cannot make Josephine a saint. She was a charming woman indeed, and possessed a winning grace that attracted men about her throughout her career, but by the universal confession of her contemporaries, she shared the loose morality of her epoch, and never showed herself of the stuff of which heroines, saints, or ordinary good women are made. Mr. Ober's admiration of Josephine has led him into transports that are occasionally somewhat ridiculous, as in the account on page 50 of the crayfish, who, "bolder than the rest, sallied forth and nipped the future Empress' little toe, thinking — and rightly — that it was a *bonne-bouche* worth some risk to reach." The most interesting part of Mr. Ober's volume deals with the early life of Josephine on the island of Martinique. He has visited the haunts of her childhood and collected the local traditions of the inhabitants about her early life. Some of the traditions are rather absurd, or at least absurdly described, but others, on the contrary, throw a vivid light upon the life of a French planter in the West Indies during the last century. Several illustrations are given of places in Martinique connected with the early history of Josephine and of her family, including a picture of Josephine's birthplace. The book is one which deserves to be added, for the reasons mentioned, to the library of any one collecting literature about Josephine, or even about Napoleon, but it cannot be considered as history in any sense of the word, and must be relegated to the department of rhapsodical biography or looked upon as a curious development of the Napoleon craze.

H. M. S.

A series of volumes entitled *Women of Colonial and Revolutionary Times* is inaugurated by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, and is doubtless destined to much popularity. Such popularity will be well deserved if all the volumes of the series are as excellent as the first, Mrs. Alice Morse Earle's *Margaret Winthrop*. The subject is well chosen, for seldom does colonial history present the relations of a husband and a wife in so great fulness and beauty as in the case of John and Margaret Winthrop. If the story of the wife cannot be told independently of that of her husband, and if Mrs. Earle has been sometimes led into the narration of matters of early Massachusetts history with which Margaret Winthrop had personally little to do, yet there is in her letters more abundant material for the delineation of her individual personality and life than will often be at the service of those who may write the subsequent volumes of the series. Mrs. Earle has based her little volume upon careful research, and has made it an interesting, graceful, and by no means unsubstantial contribution to the knowledge of Puritan life in Old and New England.

Mr. James Schouler's *History of the United States of America under the Constitution* has won its way by substantial merits into such popularity as to require a new edition ("Revised Edition," five volumes; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.). A map of the United States at an appropriate period has been added to each volume. New plates have been made for the first two volumes. In these a considerable number of small improvements have been made, partly corrections of matter, partly ameliorations of style. The only important additions seem to be in passages in which the great statesmen of the period—Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton—are characterized. One notes the effects of the author's special studies for his little book on Jefferson, but sees surprisingly little modification arising from the publication of Mr. Henry Adams' volumes, whose contribution to the knowledge of the period has been enormous, though his view of Jefferson is doubtless in many ways unsatisfactory to Mr. Schouler. The third, fourth, and fifth volumes are printed from the plates used heretofore. The plates are somewhat worn, but the right-minded reader may derive consolation from the thought which this suggests, of the wide diffusion of a good book.

A doctoral dissertation of very much more than ordinary value is *The Origin and Development of the United States Senate*, by Clara Hannah Kerr, of Cornell University (Ithaca, Andrus and Church, 197 pp.). After discussion of the formation of the Senate in the convention of 1787, its subsequent history is taken up topically, one chapter being devoted to the election of senators and organization of the Senate; another to the history of the Senate's development and practices as a legislative body; another to the Senate as an executive body; and another to the Senate as a judicial tribunal.

The research upon each point of senatorial procedure has been exceedingly thorough, the mode of representation is clear, and the judgments

are sensible and moderate. Students of constitutional history will be much indebted to the book.

It is proper to call attention to a slip on page 31, where, in speaking of the representation of both parties in committees of the Senate, the author says: "Mr. King, who had served in the Senate since the adoption of the constitution, stated in 1844 that it was the invariable practice." William R. King, who made the speech alluded to in 1844, had served in the Senate since 1819, an unusually long period, but not so extraordinary as that which is suggested in the text.

Every study which includes the early history of the United States Senate increases regret that for information respecting its proceedings we are obliged to rely so largely on the diary of the atrabilious and parvanimous Maclay. It is much to be hoped that sometime other and better narratives than his may be forthcoming. To no documents on constitutional history would the pages of this REVIEW be more gladly thrown open than to a good narrative or journal of this kind.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has just issued the thirteenth volume of its *Historical Collections*, edited and annotated, like its predecessors, by the corresponding secretary of the society, Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites. An important portion of the contents arises out of the presentation to the society by Mr. Alfred E. Bulger, of Montreal, of the papers of his father, Captain A. H. Bulger, who was in command of Fort McKay during the greater part of the period 1814-1815, during which the Fox-Wisconsin waterway was occupied by the British. These papers are now printed, and with them the papers of James Duane Doty, who was secretary in Governor Cass's expedition to Lake Superior and the sources of the Mississippi River in 1820, and had an important part in the agitation for the organization of a separate territory in Wisconsin. The first territorial census, taken in 1836, is printed in detail. The volume also has notes of the early lead mining in the Galena-River region, by the editor, and articles by Dr. O. G. Libby on the significance of the lead and shot trade in early Wisconsin history; by Mr. X. Martin on the Belgians in northeastern Wisconsin; and by the editor and Father Chrysostom Verwyst on the history of Chequamegon Bay.

A historical review must very seldom feel called upon to take notice of books of genealogy. But if there be any American family whose private records are a matter of public history, that of Lee is surely such. It is doubtful whether, all generations considered, any other family could make so substantial a claim to be, historically, the most distinguished in the United States. Beginning with Colonel Richard Lee and his grandson, President Thomas Lee, the roll of eminent names includes the latter's sons, Thomas Ludwell, Richard Henry, Francis Lightfoot, William, and Arthur, Governor Henry Lee, Charles Lee, the attorney-general, Richard Bland Lee, Governor Thomas Sim Lee, Admiral S. P. Lee, General Robert E. Lee, the greatest name of all, and the three younger generals

of the name, of whom two are still living. But it is not simply the inclusion of these noted names that gives historical importance to the portly volume which Dr. Edmund Jennings Lee of Philadelphia now publishes under the title of *Lee of Virginia, 1642-1892, Biographical and Genealogical Sketches of the Descendants of Colonel Richard Lee* (Philadelphia, the Editor, 586 pp.). The materials published in the book, collected during many years with great care by the late Cassius F. Lee, jr., of Alexandria, and by the present editor, include a large mass of varied and interesting historical matter, illustrating the history of Virginia and of the Union. In each generation, and especially under each great name, one finds a rich store of letters and documents hitherto unprinted, contributing in an important degree to our knowledge of Virginian political and social life from the days of Colonel Richard to those of General Robert Lee. The work of the editors has been done in a critical and scholarly manner, and the book has interesting illustrations taken mostly from portraits and coats-of-arms. Incidentally much information is given concerning Virginian families with which the Lees intermarried.

A word of criticism must be offered respecting the arrangement. From the point of view of genealogy it is orderly and perfectly satisfactory. But it is plain that the book will have, and was intended to have, importance from the point of view of history also. Now the historical student will find it hard to use, and will almost be reminded of the Rev. Professor Richard Henry Lee, whose lives of his grandfather and grand-uncle, with the papers on which he based them, afflict the investigator with a pain almost proportioned to their value. It is far easier to search for the historical materials contained in this book, for they are printed in connection with the names of the persons to whom they relate, and those personal names are arranged in proper genealogical order and are admirably indexed. But if the materials connected with any given name were arranged in a strictly chronological order, and if there were an index of some sort to the historical as well as to the genealogical matter, the gratitude of the reader would be much increased.

In the spring of 1895 Mr. Joshua W. Caldwell printed in the *Knoxville Tribune* a series of articles upon the constitutional history of Tennessee. They were written in aid of an effort for a constitutional convention, yet were historical and not controversial in their character. The articles, in a revised form, are now published as a book (Cincinnati, The Robert Clarke Company, 1895, pp. xiv, 183), under the title *Studies in the Constitutional History of Tennessee*. The book begins with the Watauga Association and the history of Cumberland and Franklin. Dwelling but slightly upon the organization of the Southwest Territory, it deals at some length with the constitutions of 1796, 1834, and 1870, and the progressive amendments to the same. It is quite unpretending, yet has a distinct value as a sensible, fair-minded, and intelligent sketch of a subject not without importance for readers outside of Tennessee.

Mr. Noah Brooks' *Washington in Lincoln's Time* (New York, The Century Co., 328 pp.) is one of the best books of its class. Going to Washington in 1862, as correspondent of the *Sacramento Union*, Mr. Brooks remained there until after the close of the Civil War, and wrote newspaper letters nearly every day. These, preserved in volumes of scrap-books, with other materials carefully kept, form the basis of his reminiscences. Mr. Brooks had very unusual opportunities of getting the best kind of material for such a book. He had a familiar acquaintance with many of the most important persons in Washington, and especially with Lincoln, with whom he had been almost intimate in Illinois several years before the war. Beside these superior opportunities, he has abilities, as a writer of reminiscences, far surpassing those of the ordinary newspaper correspondent. The book is exceedingly entertaining and graphic, and is also of real value to the student of history, first because of its accurate and vivid portrayal of the surface of Washington life during a momentous period, and secondly because it presents a first-hand narrative of several famous events and political complications. Especially pleasing is Mr. Brooks' contribution to a knowledge of Lincoln, whom he depicts with admiration, yet with candor.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

I. The Library of the American Antiquarian Society.

[When "No. 45, Notes on Special Collections in American Libraries," was published in the series of *Bibliographical Contributions* issued by the library of Harvard University, the library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Mass., was by chance omitted. As the pamphlet mentioned is of constant use to scholars, and as the Antiquarian Society's library is one of great importance to students of history, it has been thought that some notes upon its contents would be welcomed, as a supplement to "No. 45," by readers of the REVIEW. The following notes have been prepared by Miss Mary Robinson, assistant to the librarian, Edmund M. Barton, Esq.]

The Library was founded in 1812, by Isaiah Thomas, the Revolutionary printer, his own library forming the nucleus, to which have been added 90,000 volumes.

American history: this collection is large and growing, including general, state, and local histories, genealogy, biography, state, city, and town documents. In special departments the Library has important collections relating to *Witchcraft*, *Indian linguistics*, the *American Revolution*, *Slavery and the Civil War*.

The collection of *Congressional documents* is one of the most complete in the country.

American newspapers: a valuable collection of over 5000 volumes. Among the most complete files of the early newspapers are those of the *Boston News Letter*, *American Weekly Mercury*, *Pennsylvania Gazette*, *New York Gazette*, *New York Weekly Journal*, *New Hampshire Gazette*, *Newport Mercury*, *Connecticut Gazette*, and *Connecticut Courant*. The Library has a nearly complete file of the *Massachusetts Spy*, the oldest existing newspaper in Massachusetts. A list of the collection of newspapers, as it was in 1880, was printed in the eighth volume of the *Tenth Census*.

Mather manuscripts: this voluminous collection includes diaries, sermons, notes, and essays. The earliest treasure is the original draft of the celebrated Cambridge Platform, drawn up by Richard Mather. The form, as adopted by the synod, and printed at Cambridge in 1649, is in the Library. The autobiography of Increase Mather, written for his children, and diaries kept in his interleaved almanacs, include the years from 1660 to 1721. About 300 letters from Cotton Mather, and his diaries for the years 1692, 1699, 1703, 1709, 1711, 1713, and 1717; also several essays that have never been published, among them a theological treatise called "Triparadisus," "A Brand plucked out of the Burning," an account of witchcraft, and the experiences of Mercy Short, and a very pious and

elaborate medical essay on the common maladies of mankind, called "The Angel of Bethesda." *Printed works*, 400 volumes, by the following members of the family: Azariah, Cotton, Eleazer, Increase, Moses, Nathanael, of Salem, Nathaniel, son of Increase, Nathanael, of Dublin, Richard, Samuel, of Dublin, Samuel, of Windsor, Samuel, of Witney, England, and Samuel, of Boston. Another interesting memorial of these famous Puritans is a collection of over 900 volumes, which comprised a portion of their working library.

Historical manuscripts: 800 carefully arranged volumes, including a numerous collection of orderly-books of the Revolutionary army, together with records, muster-rolls, army orders, etc., covering the later Indian wars and the Revolutionary period; six folio volumes of the (Salem) Curwen family papers, relating to private and public affairs, covering the latter part of the seventeenth and the whole of the eighteenth centuries; William Lincoln's MSS., relating to the history of Worcester County; Christopher C. Baldwin's diaries, and his Sutton papers; also a large collection of deeds, inventories, and autograph letters; some exquisitely illuminated missals on vellum, written during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries.

The Library contains a large proportion of the early *American imprints*: the "Bay Psalm Book," printed at Cambridge, 1640; several early editions of the Cambridge Platform, and various almanacs; the *Massachusetts colonial laws* for 1660, 1672, 1675, 1692, and 1699, and an exceedingly interesting collection of sermons by the early New England divines, relating to ecclesiastical and civil matters.

Bibles: about 500 volumes, comprising the Venetian edition of 1476, and the celebrated Archbishop Cranmer Bible of 1540. This department contains both editions of the Eliot Indian Bible; the Aitkin Bible, Philadelphia, 1782, and the first folio Bible in the English language printed in America, by Isaiah Thomas, at Worcester, 1791.

Early books: a work on natural history, which Thomas, in his "History of Printing," states to have been printed as early as 1470; Petrarch De Contemptu Mundi, 1471; also a rare edition of his De Vita Solitari, 1472, which has rubricated capitals throughout; and many other valuable specimens of ancient typography.

Spanish America: about 1200 volumes, comprising works on Mexico, Central and South America. Additions to this collection are made from a fund established by Isaac and Edward L. Davis. The antiquities of Mexico and Yucatan are well illustrated by valuable collections of relics, the gift of Hon. Stephen Salisbury, the President of the Society. These are of especial value, as representing the original object of the Society, — the study of American antiquities.

Japanese literature: this collection, the gift of Hon. J. Carson Brevoort, includes issues from the leading presses of the world, from 1558 to 1859, written in six different languages.

The collection of *early voyages and travels* includes many primitive editions.

American text-books: about 4000 volumes. Many complete sets of the publications of *learned societies*.

The Library has a good collection of *Psalmody* and *Hymnology*: also a collection of maps, political broadsides, painted and engraved portraits, photographs, busts, and statues.

2. *West Florida.*

For the following list of materials in the Public Record Office at London, relating to the history of the British colony of West Florida, the REVIEW is indebted to William Beer, Esq., Librarian of the Howard Memorial Library at New Orleans.

A. AMERICA AND WEST INDIES.

- | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---|
| 252. | 1763-1765. | West Florida. | Gov. Geo. Johnstone. |
| 253. | 1765-1766. | do. | do. |
| 254. | 1766-1767. | do. | do. and Lieut.-Gov. Montfort Browne. |
| 255. | 1767-1768. | do. | Lieut.-Gov. Browne. |
| 256. | 1768-1769. | do. | do. |
| 257. | 1769-1770. | do. | do. and Lieut.-Gov. Elias Durnford. |
| 258. | 1770-1771. | do. | Governor Peter Chester. |
| 259. | 1771-1772. | do. | do. |
| 260. | 1772-1773. | do. | do. |
| 261. | 1773-1774. | do. | do. |
| 262. | 1774-1776. | do. | do. |
| 263. | 1776-1777. | do. | do. |
| 264. | 1777-1778. | do. | do. |
| 265. | 1778-1780. | do. | do. |
| 266. | 1780-1781. | do. | do. |
| 267. | 1778-1781. | do. | Military; Brigadier, afterwards Maj.-Gen. Campbell. |
| 331. | 1766, Sept. 22, to 1767, June 20. | West Florida. | No. 1. |
| 332. | 1766, Sept. 26, to 1770, July 14. | do. | No. 1. |
| 333. | 1770, Sept. 24, to 1777, Oct. 25. | do. | No. 2. |
| 334. | 1776, Dec. 26, to 1781, July 2. | do. | No. 3. |
| 438. | 1768, Feb. 14, to 1781, March 7. | do. | Entry Book A. |
| 533. | 1702 to 1782. | Floridas. | |

B. BOARD OF TRADE. ACTS.

102. 1766 to 1771. Florida, West. Nos. 1 to 46.

NOTES AND NEWS

Mrs. Mary Anne Everett Green, who died on November 4, was born in 1818. Between 1849 and 1857 she published her *Lives of the Princesses of England*, the *Diary of John Rous*, edited for the Camden Society, and the *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*. From 1857 to the present year, she has been one of the most laborious and successful of the staff of officials who edit the *Calendars of State Papers*. Her contributions to this series embraced ten volumes in the series extending from Edward VI. to James I. inclusive, eight volumes for the reign of Charles II., and the entire series (thirteen volumes) for the Commonwealth and Protectorate, with four other volumes concerning the committees of the Republic. Her work has commanded the utmost respect from the most authoritative historical writers.

Henry Reeve, C.B., who for thirty-five years was registrar of the Privy Council, and for the last forty years had been editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, died on October 21. He was born in 1813, and is noted as the translator of Tocqueville and of Guizot's *Washington*, and as the editor of Whitelock's *Journal of his Embassy*, of the memoirs of Count Vitzthum, and especially of the memoirs of his associate at the Privy Council Office, Charles Greville. He also published, in 1872, a historical volume called *Royal and Republican France*.

Auguste Mathieu Geffroy, formerly director of the French School of Archæology at Rome, died on August 16, aged 74. His chief publications were books in the field of Scandinavian history and his edition, published in concert with von Arneth, of the secret correspondence between Marie Antoinette and Count Mercy d'Argenteau.

Ruggiero Bonghi died on October 22. Born at Naples in 1828, he was for a short time a professor of ancient history at Rome, but was more noted as a minister of public instruction and as a writer. He published a *Storia della Finanza Italiana* (1864-1868), a *Bibliografia storica di Roma antica*, 1879, and a *Storia di Roma*, 1885.

Edward McPherson, clerk of the House of Representatives in seven congresses, and author of a *Political History of the United States during the Great Rebellion* and a *Political History of the United States during Reconstruction*, died on December 14, at the age of 65.

Andrew D. Mellick, author of *The Story of an Old Farm; or, Life in New Jersey in the Eighteenth Century*, died in Plainfield, N.J., on November 6, at the age of 55.

Ulick Ralph Burke, whose *History of Spain* was received so favorably last spring, died during the summer at Lima.

The annual meeting of the American Historical Association, announced to take place at Washington on December 26 and 27, will have occurred before the issue of this number of the REVIEW. At the time of our going to press, the volume of the Annual Report containing the papers read at the meeting held in December, 1894, has not yet come to hand. The usual long delay in the publication of these papers, while, doubtless, a natural incident to the connection of the Association with the federal government, is none the less to be regretted.

Messrs. Frederik Muller and Co. of Amsterdam (Doelenstraat 10) continue their series of *Remarkable Maps of the XVth, XVIth, and XVIIth Centuries* by the issue of Part II. / III., containing about twenty large maps of the seventeenth century, showing the various epochs in the cartography of Australia as understood by the Dutch cartographers, with notes by Mr. C. H. Coote of the British Museum. The edition is of one hundred copies. Parts IV., V., and VI., completing the series, will contain maps illustrating the cartographical history of America, Russia, Asia, etc. The same house announce a limited edition, in photo-lithographic facsimile of the original manuscripts, of Abel Tasman's Journal of his discovery of Van Diemen's Land and New Zealand in 1642, with documents relating to his exploration of Australia in 1644, edited by Mr. J. E. Heeres of the Dutch State Archives and Mr. C. H. Coote.

In the series of *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, published by the Historical Department of the University of Pennsylvania, the following numbers have been issued in 1895: papers upon English Towns and Gilds, edited by Professor Edward P. Cheyney; on the Napoleonic Period, edited by Professor J. H. Robinson; on the life of the Mediæval Student, edited by Mr. Dana C. Munro; on certain Monastic Tales of the Thirteenth Century, edited by Mr. Munro; on England in the time of Wycliffe, edited by Mr. Cheyney; on the Period of the Early Reformation in Germany, edited by Mr. Robinson and Mr. M. Whitcomb; and the Life of St. Columban, edited by Mr. Munro. Revised editions of the first two numbers of Vol. I., on the Early Reformation Period in England, and on Urban and the Crusaders, have also been issued.

The fifth volume of Mr. J. N. Larned's useful *History for Ready Reference* contains the articles from Tunn. to Zyp., treated in the same manner as that followed in the previous volumes of the work. Of these articles, that on the United States holds naturally the first place. A supplement contains additions to articles in the first four volumes, chiefly translations from French and German works; an extensive chronology of universal history; genealogical tables; and a selected bibliography.

The new number of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, the first number of Vol. 76, appears with the name of Professor Heinrich von Treitschke upon the title-page, in place of that of the late Heinrich von Sybel, who had been its chief editor from its foundation. In a brief preface Treitschke declares his intention of making no change in the policy of the Review.

The *Deutsche Zeitschrift für die Geschichtswissenschaft* is about to be reorganized, and from the beginning of the year 1896 may be expected to appear with more regularity and under a different editorial management.

The publishing section of the American Library Association has published through the Library Bureau a *List of Books for Girls and Women and their Clubs* by Augusta H. Leypoldt and George Iles, in which the section devoted to the bibliography of history is by Mr. R. G. Thwaites, secretary of the Wisconsin Historical Society.

Henry Holt and Co. publish a volume of *German Historical Prose*, edited by Professor Schoenfeld of Columbia University and containing representative selections from Ranke, Giesebrecht, Droysen, Sybel, Janssen, Treitschke, and Lindner.

In an article in the *Educational Review* for December, Professor A. B. Hart discusses the subject of *College Entrance Requirements in History*. Mrs. Mary Sheldon Barnes has an article in the same number on *The Teaching of Local History*.

Professor J. B. Thayer is preparing for publication a volume on the history of trial by jury. It will contain his excellent essays on that subject which appeared in the *Harvard Law Review* in 1892, revised, with new matter added.

Professor Ottokar Lorenz of Jena has just published a *Genealogisches Handbuch der europäischen Staatengeschichte* (Berlin, Wilhelm Hertz), a second edition of his *Genealogischer Schul- und Handatlas*.

The twenty-first edition of Haydn's *Dictionary of Dates* will be published immediately by Ward, Lock, and Bowden of London.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

A new journal in ancient history is the *Rivista di Storia Antica e Scienze Affini*, published at Messina under the direction of Giacomo Tropea. The first number contains an article by the editor on *L'Etna e le sue Eruzioni nelle principali Fonti greche e romane*, and a discussion by E. Cocebia *Del modo come il Senato Romano esercitava la Funzione dell' Interregno*. The list of articles in periodicals, which is to be made an important feature of the new journal, will be published in an independent form at five lire per annum under the title *Bollettino Trimestrale delle Pubblicazioni Periodiche di Storia Antica e Scienze Affini*.

Mr. Alfred Jarvis of 43 Willes Road, London, announces the addition to his series of Assyrian Reproductions of a copy of part of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser II.; namely, the panel concerning the tribute of King Jehu.

Mr. H. E. Seebohm, son of Mr. Frederic Seebohm, has published through Messrs. Macmillan an essay *On the Structure of Greek Tribal Society* which forms an excellent complement to his father's works.

Professor W. Rhys Roberts' *The Ancient Bœotians: their Character and Culture and their Reputation*, an interesting little volume in the Cambridge Historical Series, published in England by the Cambridge University Press and in this country by Macmillan, makes a successful attempt, besides giving the salient facts respecting the civilization of Bœotia, to say all that can be said in defence of the Bœotians against the prejudices which modern readers have imbibed from Attic writers.

Charles Scribner's Sons issue a new edition of Mommsen's *History of Rome*, Dr. Dickson's translation revised from the eighth German edition.

Among recent studies of the Roman province of Africa should be noted Gaston Boissier's *L'Afrique Romaine: Promenades archéologiques en Algérie et en Tunisie*, (Paris, Hachette), and Toutain's *Les Cités Romaines de la Tunisie* (Paris, Thorin).

Among recent dissertations in ancient history, separately published, may be noted R. W. Rogers, *Outlines of the History of Early Babylonia*, Leipzig (74 pp.); C. Peters, *Das goldene Ophir Salomo's: eine Studie zur Geschichte der phönikischen Weltpolitik*, Munich (64 pp.); E. Curtius, *Der Synoikismos von Elis*, Berlin (14 pp.); R. Nordin, *Die äussere Politik Spartas zur Zeit der ersten Perserkriege*, Upsala (93 pp.); P. E. Rosenstock, *Die Akten der Arval-Brüderschaft*, Strassburg (27 pp.); F. Luterbacher, *Die römischen Legionen und Kriegsschiffe während des zweiten punischen Krieges*, Burgdorf (44 pp.); V. Ferrenbach, *Die Amici populi Romani republikanischer Zeit*, Strassburg (76 pp.); L. Blomgren, *Th. Mommsens Theorie om Romerska Principaten*, Upsala (189 pp.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Jacobi, *Der vedische Kalender und das Alter des Veda* (Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, XLIX. 2); E. Amélineau, *Les Fouilles récentes en Egypte* (Revue des deux Mondes, July 15); Ed. Meyer, *Die wirthschaftliche Entwicklung des Alterthums* (Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie, IX.); R. Pöhlmann, *Aus dem hellenischen Mittelalter* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXV. 2); G. de Sanctis, *Agatocle* (Rivista di Filologia, I. 3); G. B. Grundy, *The Trebbia and Lake Trasimene* (Journal of Philology, No. 47); G. Bloch, *La Religion des Gaulois* (Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, XV. 6, 8).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

The first volume of Harnack's *History of Dogma*, translated from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan, has been published by Roberts Brothers. Harnack has recently printed, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, an important monograph on *Tertullian in der Literatur der alten Kirche*.

Among recent German dissertations in early church history, separately published, may be noted, R. Berg, *Der heilige Mauricius und die thebäische Legion*, Halle (59 pp.); and H. Gelzer, *Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche*, Leipzig (66 pp.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *Lightfoot's Apostolic Fathers* (Quarterly Review, October); E. Petersen, *Blitz- und Regenwunder an der Markus-Säule* (Rheinisches Museum, L. 3); Asmus, *Eine Encyclika Julians des Abtrünnigen und ihre Vorläufer* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, July, October); Müller, *Die Bussinstitution in Karthago unter Cyprian* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, July, October); C. H. Turner, *The Paschal Canon of "Anatolius of Laodicea"* (English Historical Review, October).

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY.

A new edition of Potthast's *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi* is announced by Weber of Berlin, and the first section has appeared. Subsequent notice of this in our pages may be expected.

Mr. George Haven Putnam continues his works on book-making with a volume entitled *Books and their Makers during the Middle Ages* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons).

Among recent German dissertations in mediæval history, separately published, may be noted: A. Dove, *Das älteste Zeugnis für den Namen Deutsch*, Munich (13 pp.); P. Geyer, *Adamnanus, Abt von Iona*, Augsburg (47 pp.); and M. Claar, *Die Entwicklung der venetianischen Verfassung von der Einsetzung bis zur Schliessung des grossen Rates, 1172-1297*, Munich (58 pp.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Sackur, *Die Promissio Pippin's vom Jahre 754 und ihre Erneuerung durch Karl den Grossen* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XVI. 3); Ad. Schaube, *Studien zur Geschichte und Natur des ältesten Cambiums* (Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie, LXV. 2); *St. Francis of Assisi* (Church Quarterly Review, July).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

The latest issues in the series of *Old South Leaflets* (58-64) contain reprints of certain Letters of Hooper to Bullinger, Sir John Eliot's Apologie for Socrates, certain Ship-Money Papers, Pym's Speech against

Strafford, Cromwell's Second Speech, Milton's Ready and Easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth, and Sir Henry Vane's Defence.

The sixth volume of Lavisse and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale* (Paris, Colin) is devoted to the age of Louis XIV., 1643-1715. The seventh volume, now appearing, will continue the work to 1788.

Ch. Laurent has published at Brussels the first volume (762 pp.) of a *Recueil des Ordonnances de Charles Quint*.

Professor Kovalevsky, of Moscow, has begun the publication of a work in four volumes, in Russian, on the origins of modern democracy.

Among recent dissertations in modern history, separately published, may be noted: M. Reich, *Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Berlin (32 pp.); A. Evers, *Das Verhältnis Luthers zu den Humanisten*, Rostock (128 pp.); P. Schreckenbach, *Luther und der Bauernkrieg*, Leipzig (45 pp.); V. Hantzsch, *Die überseeischen Unternehmungen der Augsburger Welser*, Leipzig (42 pp.); F. Kunz, *Österreich und der spanisch-englische Hieratsplan vom Jahre 1623*, Wien (42 pp.); V. Löwe, *Die Organisation und Verwaltung der Wallensteinschen Heere*, Freiburg (39 pp.); E. Haumant, *La Guerre du Nord et la Paix d'Oliva*, Paris (Colin); W. K. A. Nippold, *Die Regierung der Königin Mary Stuart von England, 1689-1695*, Hamburg (100 pp.); F. Lohmann, *Vauban*, Berlin (46 pp.); A. v. Ruville, *William Pitt und Graf Bute*, Berlin (119 pp.); J. Mayer, *Die französisch-spanische Allianz in den Jahren 1796 bis 1807*, Linz a. D.; J. Bauer, *Napoleon I. und seine militärische Proklamationen*, Munich (68 pp.); P. Träger, *Die politische Dichtung in Deutschland, 1800-1850*, Munich (44 pp.); B. v. Simson, *Über L. von Ranke und seine Schule*, Freiburg (38 pp.); W. Sutermeister, *Metternich und die Schweiz, 1840-1848*, Bern (94 pp.); P. Laband, *Die Wandlungen der deutschen Reichsverfassung*, Dresden (v. Zahn u. Jänsch).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. H. R. Tatham, *Erasmus in Italy* (English Historical Review, October); Merx, *Zur Geschichte des Klosterlebens im Anfange der Reformationszeit* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, October); H. Forst, *Der türkische Gesandte in Prag 1620 und der Briefwechsel des Winterkönigs mit Sultan Osman II.* (Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XVI. 4); Luckwaldt, *Der Vertrag von Westminster 1756* (Preussische Jahrbücher, LXXX. 2).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

A new edition of Scargill-Bird's *Handbook to the Public Record Office*, adapted to the present arrangement of the records, is soon to be published.

The officials of the English Public Record Office have started at five different points a *Calendar of Patent Rolls* from Edward I. to Henry VII., one portion (1292-1301) of which is printed, while others are already in

type. A *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, of the reign of William and Mary has also been undertaken. Vol. II. (1305-1342) of the calendar of entries in the Papal Registries relating to Great Britain and Ireland, (Papal Letters, ed. W. H. Bliss) has been brought out; likewise the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, for 1671, ed. F. H. B. Daniell. The third volume of Hume's *Calendars of State Papers preserved in the Archives of Simancas*, etc., including the years from 1580 through 1586, will appear not later than January, 1896. The succeeding volume (1587-1588, inclusive) will probably appear in January, 1897. A new volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, formerly edited by Mr. Noel Sainsbury, and now edited by Hon. John W. Fortescue, may shortly be expected.

In the forty-fourth volume (Paston—Percy) of the *Dictionary of National Biography* the articles which are of most interest to historical students are those on St. Patrick, by Rev. T. Olden; Peel, by Hon. George Peel; Penn, by J. M. Rigg; Pepys, by Leslie Stephen; Peckham and Perceval, the Percys and the Pelhams.

Lord Acton's inaugural lecture delivered at Cambridge last June has been printed in a little volume by Macmillan and Co. (143 pp.).

In 1870 the University of Oxford accepted a legacy of two thousand pounds under the will of the Rev. James Ford, the income from which was to be applied to the foundation of a professorship of English history. The income being insufficient, nothing was done until 1893, when some of the history tutors proposed the establishment, with this income, of an annual course of historical lectures to be delivered at Oxford and to be printed under the title of the *Ford Lectures on English History*. Congregation at first approved but afterwards threw out the proposal. In last August, however, a decree was obtained from the Chancery court permitting the foundation of the projected Ford lectureship in the place of the attempted professorship.

Battles of English History, by Hereford B. George, Fellow of New College, Oxford, presents individual accounts of a series of battles extending from Hastings to the Indian Mutiny, accompanied by brief essays on the progress of the art of war.

The 600th anniversary of the first representative English Parliament was commemorated by the Massachusetts Society of Colonial Wars at the Old South Church, Boston, on the evening of November 27. Mr. A. C. Goodell, jr., delivered an address on the early English Parliament and the early representative assemblies of the Massachusetts Colony.

The third volume of Mr. J. Hamilton Wylie's *History of Henry IV.* has just been published.

Mr. Oppenheim, whose articles on naval history in the *English Historical Review* have excited favorable notice, expects to publish in about a year a *Naval History of England*, which shall continue the work of Sir Harris Nicolas down to the year 1660.

Julian Corbett, who wrote a life of Drake for the "English Men of Action" series, hopes to publish within a year, probably under the title *The Rise of English Sea Power*, a history of the English navy during the latter half of the sixteenth century, grouping it about the life of Drake.

A publication of some interest to students of Elizabethan history is Dr. Richard Ehrenberg's *Hamburg und England im Zeitalter der Königin Elisabeth* (Jena, G. Fischer, 362 pp.).

Professor J. K. Laughton, secretary of the Navy Records Society and editor of *State Papers relating to the Defeat of the Armada*, is now editing for the Society the documents bearing upon Blake's career in the war against the Dutch. Other publications of the Society will be a book of naval accounts and inventories under Henry VIII., edited by Mr. Oppenheim, to be ready, probably, by November, 1896, and a volume of French and English documents on the little naval war of 1512-1513, by M. Alfred Spont.

The British Museum has acquired forty miscellaneous volumes of materials gathered by Sir James Mackintosh in preparation for the writing of his *History of England from the Revolution of 1688*. These materials, however, are most abundant and remarkable for the period of the Commonwealth.

Mr. J. E. P. Wallis, editor of the *State Trials*, is preparing a *History of Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Communications on Gildas, various (Academy, September 14, 28, October 5, 12, 19, 26, November 2, 16); H. B. Simpson, *The Office of Constable* (English Historical Review, October); G. Strickland, *Ricerche istoriche acerca di S. Bonifazio di Savoia, arcivescovo di Canterbury* (Miscellanea di Storia Italiana, XXXII.); J. Loserth, *Das vermeintliche Schreiben Wiclif's an Urban VI.*, etc. (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXV. 3); J. Forbes-Leith, *La Révolution Religieuse en Angleterre à l'Avènement d'Elizabeth* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); J. G. Alger, *An Irish Absentee and his Tenants, 1768-1792* (English Historical Review, October); E. Pariset, *La Société de la Révolution de Londres dans ses rapports avec Burke et l'Assemblée Constituante* (Révolution Française, October 14); *Crimean Letters* (Edinburgh Review, October); H. B. Adams, *Freeman, the Scholar and Professor* (Yale Review, November); *Freeman, Froude, and Seeley* (Quarterly Review, October).

FRANCE

The *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études* for 1896 contains, besides the usual documents and reports on the work of the school, a brief paper by M. Monod, *Du Rôle de l'Opposition des Races et des Nationalités dans la Dissolution de l'Empire Carolingien*, in which the author points out the indications of national feeling in the latter half of the ninth and in the tenth century.

The last volume issued in the *Collection de Textes* for the use of students is the *Annales Gandenses*, edited by Frank Funck-Brentano (Paris, Picard).

A. Waddington has just published the first volume of a work entitled *La République des Provinces-Unies, la France, et les Pays-Bas Espagnols de 1630 à 1650* (Paris, Masson).

The Duke of Aumale has published (Paris, Calmann-Lévy) the seventh and concluding volume of his *Histoire des Princes de Condé*.

R. Stourm has just published a useful *Bibliographie Historique des Finances de la France au dix-huitième Siècle* (Paris, Guillaumin, 341 pp.).

The Comte de Ségur has published an interesting biography of the Maréchal de Ségur (1724-1801), whose military career covers the years from 1739 to 1787 (Paris, Plon, 398 pp.).

Professor Georg Jellinek, of Heidelberg, has published, under the title *Die Erklärung der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte* (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot), a study of the origin of the Declaration of the Rights of Man voted by the French National Assembly on August 26, 1789. Its purpose is to show that the chief source of this declaration was not the Contrat Social of Rousseau, but the declarations of rights promulgated by Virginia and the other American States at the time of the Revolution; and to discuss the origins of the American bills of rights and the subsequent influence of them and of the French Declaration.

Professor F. A. Aulard has published the fifth volume of his *La Société des Jacobins*, covering the period from January, 1793, to March, 1794; and Vol. VIII. of his *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, 4 brumaire-6 frimaire an II. (Paris, Leroux, 775 pp.).

A documentary collection of great value for the history of an important episode in the French Revolution is being issued by M. Ch. L. Chassin. His three volumes entitled *Préparation de la Guerre de Vendée* are now followed by four volumes of a similar documentary character entitled *La Vendée Patriote* (Paris, Dupont). Three more volumes are promised, to cover the history of the conclusion of the Vendean troubles and to carry the narrative down to the Concordat.

The centenary of the Institute of France has called forth an illustrated work by the Comte de Franqueville, entitled *Le premier Siècle de l'Institut de France* (25 October, 1795-25 October, 1895). The first volume treats of the history and organization of the Institute and contains biographical and bibliographical notices of its members (Paris, Rothschild).

A work which promises to be indispensable to all thorough students of the Napoleonic period is the prodigious bibliography which Alberto Lumbroso is publishing under the title *Saggio di una Bibliografia ragionata per servire alla Storia dell' Epoca Napoleonica* (Rome, Modes e Mendel; Paris, Librairie Militaire). The first four numbers, covering the authors' names

from A to Bem, occupy 700 pages; the work is done with a carefulness corresponding to its comprehensiveness.

M. Ernest Daudet sets forth in excellent fashion a curious chapter in the history of the Napoleonic period in his *La Police et les Chouans sous le Consulat et l'Empire* (Paris, Plon).

M. Barthélemy-St. Hilaire, whose death at the age of ninety occurred on November 25, had just published (Paris, Hachette) three volumes entitled *Victor Cousin, sa Vie et sa Correspondance*, important for the history of political as well as literary affairs in the generation succeeding the Restoration.

The fourth and fifth volumes of the *Souvenirs du Baron de Barante* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy) cover the period from 1830 to 1837, and afford much interesting information concerning the external and internal policy of the government of Louis Philippe.

M. Pierre de la Gorce has published the first two volumes of an important *Histoire du Second Empire* (Paris, Plon). These two volumes bring the narrative down to the beginning of the Italian war.

Other important books upon the history of the Second Empire are, *La Vie Militaire du Général Ducrot d'après sa Correspondance* (two vols., Paris, Plon), conveying the memoirs of an intelligent aide-de-camp of Napoleon III., and M. Étienne Lamy's *Études sur le Second Empire* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy).

Count Benedetti's *Essais Diplomatiques* (Paris, Plon, 401 pp.) relate chiefly, as might be expected, to the origin of the war of 1870.

Commandant Rousset has published, under the special title *Les Armées de Province*, the fourth volume of his general history of the Franco-German war. This volume deals with the Army of the Loire. The fifth and sixth will give the history of the Armies of the North and East.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Allain, chanoine, *L'Eglise de Bordeaux au dernier Siècle du Moyen Age* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October; and *Dublin Review*, October); Calmette, *La Question du Roussillon sous Louis XI.* (*Annales du Midi*, October); A. Spont, *Les Galères Royales dans la Méditerranée, 1406-1518* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October); J. Loutchitsky, *De la petite Propriété en France avant la Révolution, et de la Vente des Biens Nationaux* (*Revue Historique*, September); H. M. Stephens, *The French Revolution: the Work of the Committees of Legislation and Public Instruction in the Convention* (*Yale Review*, November); H. Welschinger, *Le Directoire et le Concile National de 1797* (*Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, Compte-rendu*, August); *Memoirs of Barras* (*Edinburgh Review*, October); W. M. Sloane, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* (*The Century*, — January); *The French in Madagascar* (*Edinburgh Review*, October); H. Delbrück, *Das Geheimniss der napoleonischen Politik im Jahre 1870* (*Preussische Jahr-*

bücher, October); Duc de Broglie, *La Mission de M. de Gontaut à Berlin, 1872-1878* (Correspondant, July, August, October); Chesnelong, *La Tentative de Restauration Monarchique de 1873* (Correspondant, September); Cte. d'Haussonville, *Le Comte de Paris* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

The Italian Historical Congress was held at Rome in the latter part of September.

The *Revista Crítica de Historia y Literatura Españolas*, which began to appear last March, justifies its title as critical and its claim to public attention and respect. Attentive to Portuguese as well as to Spanish publications, it furnishes the student of Peninsular history with the best means he has yet had for keeping *au courant*. The new journal appears monthly; its office is at Madera Alta, 27, segundo, Madrid. It has no "body-articles," but begins, after the manner of the famous French journal of similar name, with reviews of books. Its contents, more largely historical than purely literary, embrace also bibliographies, especially of recent publications, a "Revista de Revistas," and news notes. It takes particular pains, and with great success, to keep its readers informed of all foreign publications concerning Spanish history. Señor Rafael Altamira, whose most recent book is reviewed upon another page, is the historical editor. Subscriptions are sent to Victoriano Suarez, 48 Preciados, Madrid.

The Real Academia de la Historia has published (Madrid, 91 pp.) a general index to the first twenty-five volumes of its *Boletín*.

A work which will be received with great interest, and which is expected to be published shortly, is a book by D. Ricardo Hinojosa, the fruit of personal researches at Rome, entitled *Materiales para la Historia de España en el Archivo Secreto de la Santa Sede*.

Vol. CXI. of the *Colección de Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España* continues from September, 1572, to December, 1574, the correspondence of the German princes and the Spanish ambassadors at Vienna with Philip II.

A doctoral dissertation of unusual importance and value is that published by Dr. William F. Tilton, entitled *Die Katastrophe der spanischen Armada, 31 juli-8 august 1588* (Freiburg i. B., C. A. Wagner, 150 pp.), a most careful study of that great episode, based upon printed and manuscript original materials. His *Atlantic* article is noted under Great Britain.

The second volume of Diercks' *Geschichte Spaniens* has just appeared, carrying the work to the present time (Berlin, Siegfried Cronbach).

The Spanish government is publishing a complete edition of its treaties with foreign powers and other diplomatic documents of the period since Isabella II. The collection (*Colección de los Tratados, etc., con los Estados extranjeros*) is edited by the Marquis de la Vega de Armijo and the Duke de Tetuan, ministers of state. Vol. VI. has appeared.

A new volume of the *Portugalliae Monumenta Historica* is in the press.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Santini, *Studi sull' antica Costituzione del Comune di Firenze* (Archivio Storico Italiano, XVI. 1); H. C. Lea, *Die Inquisition von Toledo von 1575-1610* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XIV. 2); G. Rodriguez, *Hispaniae Schola Musica Sacra, ed. Pedrell* (Revista Crítica de Historia y Literatura Españolas, September); *Village Communities in Spain* (Quarterly Review, October); C. Roque da Costa, *Historias da Relações diplomaticas de Portugal no Oriente* (Boletim da Sociedade de Geographia de Lisboa, XIII. 12); Cte. du Hamel de Breuil, *Carvalho, marquis de Pombal* (Revue Historique, September).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

Vol. XXXIX. of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* has appeared, covering the names from Tunner to de Vins.

A bibliography of the works of Reinhold Pauli, *Verzeichnis der von Reinhold Pauli verfassten Bücher, Aufsätze und Kritiken* (Halle, Karras), has been published by a former pupil of Pauli, Dr. F. Liebermann.

Professor Felix Dahn has published the third Abtheilung of Vol. VII. of his *Könige der Germanen*, continuing the study of the Merovingian period (Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, 581 pp.).

A sixth and concluding volume of W. von Giesebrecht's *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, covering the last years of Frederick Barbarossa, has been edited from his manuscripts and published (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot) by B. von Simson. The volume consists in about equal proportion of text and of notes to Vols. V. and VI. A portion of the text and the notes to Vol. V. were written by Giesebrecht; the rest is by Simson, whose part has been more than that of an editor.

In the new edition of the *Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* the latest issues (67, 68), both edited by Geo. Grandaur, are of Vincenz v. Gerlach, and of the Monk of Weingarten's history of the Welfs (Leipzig, Dyk, 170, 80 pp.).

In Vol. XVI. of the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* is printed a general review of the recent literature respecting the history of German municipalities, by K. Uhlirz.

In the series of *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, published by the Historical Commission connected with the Bavarian Academy, the latest

issue (Vol. XXIV., Leipzig, S. Hirzel, clxxiv, 283 pp.) is the third volume of the *Chroniken der westfälischen und niederrheinischen Städte*, covering Soest and Duisburg.

The Historical Commission connected with the Vienna Academy has published the third and concluding volume of its *Venetianische Depeschen vom Kaiserhofe*, edited by Dr. Gust. Turba (Vienna, C. Gerold's Sohn, 778 pp.).

Dr. Onno Klopp has published (Paderborn, Schöningh) the first part (1628-1630) of Vol. III. of his *Der dreissigjährige Krieg bis zum Tode Gustav Adolfs*.

In the series dealing with the internal policy of the Great Elector appears a treatise by K. Breysig entitled *Geschichte der brandenburgischen Finanzen 1640-1697* (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot), of which the first volume deals chiefly with the central organs of financial administration (xxxiv, 932 pp.).

Vol. XXII. of the *Politische Correspondenz Friedrichs des Grossen* has been published by the Prussian Academy (Berlin, Duncker, 637 pp.).

Professor Karl Biedermann is printing a fourth (popular) edition of his *Dreissig Jahre deutscher Geschichte 1840-1870*, with a continuation covering the ensuing twenty-five years, the first quarter-century of the new German Empire (Breslau, Schlesische Buchdruckerei).

Dr. Hans Blum's *Fürst Bismarck und seine Zeit* (Munich, C. H. Beck) has been completed by the issue of Vols. V. and VI. Dr. H. Ritter von Poschinger's *Fürst Bismarck und die Parlamentarier* (Breslau, E. Trewendt) is also completed, by the publication of a third volume, covering the years from 1879 to 1890.

Dr. Paul Schweizer has concluded his important *Geschichte der schweizerischen Neutralität* (Frauenfeld, Huber, 1032 pp.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Kossinna, *Der Ursprung des Germanennamens* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache, XX.); H. Delbrück, *Der urgermanische Gau und Staat* (Preussische Jahrbücher, September); F. Kurze, *Ueber die karolingischen Reichsannalen von 741 bis 829 und ihre Uebersetzung* (Neues Archiv, XX., XXI. 1); Hasenöhl, *Deutschlands südöstliche Marken im 10., 11., und 12. Jahrhundert* (Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, LXXXII. 2); K. Wenck, *Konrad von Gelnhausen und die Quellen der konziliaren Theorie* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVI. 1); E. Gothein, *Zur Geschichte der Rheinschiffahrt* (Westdeutsche Zeitschrift, XIV. 3); J. Müller, *Der Konflikt Kaiser Rudolfs II. mit den deutschen Reichsstädten* (Westdeutsche Zeitschrift, XIV. 3); M. Ritter, *Der Ursprung des Restitutionsediktes* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXVI. 1); P. Bailleu, *König Friedrich Wilhelm II. und die Genesis des Friedens von Basel* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXV. 2); P. Bigelow, *The German Struggle for Liberty* (Harper's Magazine, — January); *Brief-*

wechsel Leopold Ranke's mit Varnhagen von Ense [1827-1828] (*Deutsche Revue*, August, September); R. Reuss, *Heinrich von Sybel* (*Revue Historique*, November, p. 450); R. Oldenbourg and F. Meinecke, *H. von Sybel* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXV. 3); J. I. Good, *The Antistes of Zurich* (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, October); W. B. Duffield, *The War of the Sonderbund* (*English Historical Review*, October).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

P. J. Blok reviews the recent historical literature concerning the Netherlands in the *Revue Historique*, September; A. Delescluse the Belgian, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, October.

M. Müller, archivist of the city of Utrecht, is preparing for publication a monumental collection of the documents contained in the archives of the city.

The Dutch government has published (The Hague, Nijhoff) a large volume containing the report of Mr. Brugmans on his systematic researches in the archives and libraries of England undertaken for historical purposes at the expense of the Dutch government. The volume contains an enormous amount of information concerning the relations between England and the Netherlands.

Vol. LII. of the memoirs of the Royal Academy of Belgium contains an important study (420 pp.) by P. Alexandre on the history of the Privy Council in the old Netherlands.

Professor Bussemaker, of Groningen, has published the first volume of an important work entitled *De Afscheiding der waelsche Gewesten van de Generale Unie* (Haarlem, Bohn), dealing with a turning-point in the history of the Dutch Republic and the Spanish Low Countries.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The latest issue in the Saga Library (London, Quaritch) is the third volume of the *Heimskringla*, which is to be completed in four volumes.

Dr. Woldemar Buck has printed, as an appendix to the annual report of St. Anne's School, in St. Petersburg, for 1894-1895, an excellent dissertation on *Der deutsche Handel in Nowgorod bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (St. Petersburg, R. Hoenniger, 90 pp.).

The *Revue Critique* (1895, No. 29) has a summary account of recent Hungarian works on the history of Hungary.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Dietrich Schäfer, *Zur Geschichte der Begründung der schwedisch-norwegischen Union* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXV. 3); F. de Rocca, *Les Assemblées Politiques dans la Russie ancienne* (*Revue Historique*, November).

AMERICA.

The Congrès des Américanistes was this year held in the City of Mexico, October 15-20.

The Secretary of the Treasury proposes to obtain from Congress legislation authorizing him to get rid of a large part of the documents officially deemed useless which have been collecting for a century past in the archives of the government buildings throughout the country. With this object in view, he has sent out a circular to the various collectors of customs and of internal revenue requesting them to send him "a list of such record books, papers, and documents in your charge which, in your judgment, have no permanent value or historical interest," together with descriptions of the volumes and an approximate estimate of their weight.

Secretary Olney has directed that the copperplate made early in the century from the original Declaration of Independence shall be locked up in a fire-proof safe in the Department of State. The original Declaration, fading by reason of the process employed in making the copperplate, has been kept out of the light and air since February, 1894.

The Bureau of Rolls and Library in the Department of State has issued as a supplement to No. 4 of its *Bulletin* a full index to the Calendar of the Correspondence of James Madison.

The *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, Vol. X., Part 1, contains the papers read at the Boston meeting in April, 1895. Most important among these are those of Mr. S. S. Green on the Scotch-Irish in America; of Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis on the Law of Adultery and Ignominious Punishments, with especial reference to the penalty of wearing a letter permanently affixed to the clothing; of Mr. R. G. Thwaites on the Story of Chequamegon Bay; and of Mr. Lucien Carr on the Food of Certain American Indians and their Methods of preparing it.

No. 4 of the *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* consists entirely of the proceedings in the trial of Jorge de Almeida by the Inquisition of Mexico in 1607-1609, edited by Dr. Cyrus Adler.

In the series of *American History Leaflets* issued by Professors Hart and Channing of Harvard University (New York, A. Lovell and Co.) No. 21 contains the text of the Stamp Act.

This year's session of the Scotch-Irish Congress is to be held at Harrisburg, Penn., in May.

The *Nation* of October 17 and October 31, 1895, contains long, interesting, and valuable lists of manuscripts relating to the history of America which are preserved in the British Museum. The second list concerns more especially New England and Virginia.

Messrs. Burrows Brothers of Cleveland expect to begin this month the publication of a complete reprint of the famous and exceedingly rare *Jesuit Relations* respecting New France. The reprint will consist of some sixty volumes. The original text will be reproduced in fac-simile and will be accompanied page for page by a careful English translation, with notes, by Mrs. Jane Marsh Parker. The edition will be limited to 750 copies.

Mr. Andrew McF. Davis has reprinted from the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts a careful and valuable paper upon *Provincial Banks: Land and Silver*.

Mr. Frederick D. Stone, librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, has printed, in pamphlet form, *The Battle of Brandywine*, an address delivered in Birmingham meeting-house before the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, June 18, 1895.

Dr. W. E. Griffis' *Townsend Harris, First American Envoy in Japan* (Boston, Houghton, 351 pp.), giving the journal of Harris from August 1856 to August 1858, is a most important contribution to the history of the early relations between the United States and Japan.

The Military Historical Society of Massachusetts propose to publish, in a series of volumes, the papers which have been read at its meetings. The first volume issued, numbered Vol. X., is of a general nature, and is entitled *Critical Sketches of Some of the Federal and Confederate Commanders*. It contains articles by Mr. John C. Ropes on Beauregard, McClellan, Sherman, and Stuart; by Colonel Theodore A. Dodge on Grant; by General Francis A. Walker on Hancock; by General J. H. Wilson on Humphreys; and by Colonels Henry Stone and T. L. Livermore on Thomas; also a paper entitled "The War as we see it now," by Mr. Ropes (Houghton, Mifflin and Co.). The society have also issued enlarged and improved editions of their volumes (I. and II.) on the *Peninsular Campaign of General McClellan in 1862*, and on the *Virginia Campaign of 1862 under General Pope*.

Mr. Arthur Sinclair has published, under the title of *Two Years on the Alabama* (Boston, Lee and Shepard), a highly interesting narrative of his experiences as Confederate lieutenant on board that cruiser.

The October number of the *Collections and Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society* contains an article by Dr. Henry S. Burrage on Charter Rights of Massachusetts in Maine in the Early Part of the Eighteenth Century, and one by M. A. Safford on General William Whipple.

The New Hampshire Historical Society has received from Mr. Albert Langdon-Elwyn, of Philadelphia, a miscellaneous collection of the papers of Governor John Langdon, covering the period from 1761 to 1816.

The original manuscript of Bradford's *History of Plimoth Plantation* has been reproduced in photographic fac-simile, with an introduction by

Mr. John A. Doyle. The edition is limited; copies are for sale by Ward and Downing in London and by Houghton, Mifflin and Co. in Boston.

The Essex Institute has published, during the year 1895, besides three parts of its Bulletin and four parts of its Historical Collections, a special catalogue of books on China.

The Brookline (Mass.) Historical Publication Society has begun the issue of a series of small publications relating to local history.

Mr. Sidney S. Rider of Providence, R.I., proposes to issue, if enough subscriptions are obtained, a limited edition (one hundred copies) of a fac-simile reproduction of the manuscript Digest of 1705, the first Digest of the laws of the colony of Rhode Island.

The October number of the *Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society* contains the beginning of a monograph by Henry C. Dorr on the Proprietors of Providence and their Controversies with the Freeholders, and a historical account of the papers of General Nathanael Greene, by J. F. Jameson.

The legislature of Connecticut at its last session ordered that copies of the following resolution be sent to all town clerks in the state: "Resolved by this assembly: That every town clerk in this state shall examine carefully the town records of his town, and make a true copy of all that relates to the Revolutionary War in such records, between the year 1774 and the year 1784 inclusive, preserving the original spelling and capitals, and the original form of the record as far as may be, giving the page and volume of the record, and shall certify that it is a true copy of the record, and mail the same to the state librarian at Hartford on or before January 1, 1896; and shall be paid therefor, by the state, at the rate of twenty-five cents per legal page. Where there is no such record the town clerk shall so certify."

The annual report of the Connecticut Historical Society contains a list of Connecticut local histories which are to be found in the Library of the Society and in the Watkinson Library.

Mr. Theodore Roosevelt's *New York*, published some years ago by Messrs. Longman and Co. in their series of *Historic Towns*, is now reissued with a postscript concerning the events of the past five years.

The historical documents preserved by the state of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg are now being arranged and classified. They are also to be carefully indexed. Dr. William H. Egle is preparing a considerable amount of documentary material for publication in the third series of the *Pennsylvania Archives*, and is reprinting his first series of *Pennsylvania Genealogies*.

Beside various matters of genealogical and local interest the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* contains an interesting statement of grievances by the inhabitants of Charles City

County, made in 1676 to the King's Commissioners, and a series of replies by Governor Gooch to inquiries made by the Lords of Trade. The date of the latter document and the place from which it has been obtained are not stated.

It is understood that in the disastrous fire which destroyed the chief building of the University of Virginia, no harm came to that portion of the manuscripts of Arthur Lee which were in the possession of the library of the University.

The October issue of the *William and Mary College Quarterly* contains an article by the editor, President L. G. Tyler, on Washington and his Neighbors and a variety of documents interesting to the student of Virginian history.

No. 1, Part 2, of Mr. Edward W. James's *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary* contains lists of slave-owners in Princess Anne County in 1850, and of owners and employers of slaves in the same county in 1860; also a document showing the naturalization of James Silk Buckingham in 1810.

The Cabells and their Kin, by Dr. Alexander Brown, author of *The Genesis of the United States*, has a historical as well as a biographical and genealogical importance (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co.).

Dr. George W. Graham and Mr. Alexander Graham have printed at Charlotte, N.C., a revised and enlarged edition of their pamphlet entitled *Why North Carolinians believe in the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence of May 20th, 1775*, which can be recommended as a fair and sensible presentation of its side of a much-disputed question.

The state of South Carolina makes progress in its scheme of publishing its Colonial records. Several volumes of transcripts from London archives have been received and are now being indexed in preparation for publication.

At Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., persons interested in the general study of Southern history in accordance with modern scientific ideas have formed an organization for that purpose called the Vanderbilt Historical Society.

The last biennial report of the Secretary of State of Louisiana contains a chronological list of the various officials of the territory and state.

The Louisiana Historical Society contemplates the issue of a more important publication than any it has heretofore maintained.

The Minnesota Historical Society, of which Mr. Warren Upham has lately become the secretary, has recently acquired a large collection of the correspondence and other papers of the late General H. H. Sibley, who had been identified with the history of Minnesota from its beginning. He came to Fort Snelling in 1834, and his letters from his subordinates

in the fur trade, from the early missionaries, from travellers and others, constitute by far the most important body of material on the affairs of Minnesota for the past sixty years. He was delegate of the territory in Congress, president of its constitutional convention, and the first governor of the state, and held a prominent position in its affairs down to the time of his death in 1891. During all this period he preserved his letters with great care.

The Nebraska State Historical Society is about to publish the manuscript records of the Nebraska Colonization Society of the fifties.

M. Philéas Gagnon has just published a large and important volume of Canadian bibliography. It is entitled *Essai de Bibliographie Canadienne* and contains an annotated list of the works relating to Canada (books, manuscripts, pamphlets, maps, plans, etc.) collected by M. Gagnon in the course of the past twenty years; some five thousand items are included. They are arranged in alphabetical order and are occasionally illustrated by fac-similes of title-pages and autographs.

P. Cappa continues his *Estudios sobre la Dominación española en América* with a section (Vol. XIII., Part 4, 349 pp.) on the fine arts, — painting, sculpture, music, and engraving.

The Chilean government has brought out (Santiago de Chile, 1895, 428 pp.) the sixth volume of its *Colección de Documentos inéditos para la Historia de Chile, 1518-1818*. It is edited by J. T. Medina, and is concerned with Almagro and his companions.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals (Period before 1607): W. J. Hoffman, *Fälschungen der amerikanischen Antiquitäten* (Globus, LXVII. 1); B. Moses, *The Early Political Organization of Mexico* (Yale Review, November);

(Colonial): J. Fiske, *The Starving Time in Old Virginia* (Atlantic Monthly, December); L. D. Scisco, *Rural Militia of the New Netherlands* (American Historical Register, November); G. Bonet-Maury, *La Rochelle en Amérique* [New Rochelle] (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, July-September); Stellhorn, *Die lutherische Kirche in Nord-Amerika* (Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1895, 1, 4); René de Kerallain, *La Capitulation du fort Guillaume-Henri, 1757* (Revue Historique, November); W. H. Bailey, *The Regulators of North Carolina* (American Historical Register, November, December);

(Revolutionary, — 1789): C. W. Ernst, *Mail Service in the United States, 1773-1792* (L'Union Postale, November); L. B. Newcomb, *Songs and Ballads of the Revolution* (New England Magazine, December); W. C. Ford, *Defences of Philadelphia in 1777*, cont. (Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, October); V. Timiriazev, on Paul Jones in the Black Sea (Istorich. Viestnik, July); W. S. Baker, *Washington after the Revolution [1784-1789]* (Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, October); J. W. Burgess, *The Constitution*

of the United States (Chautauquan, October, January); W. C. Ford, *Letters of Elbridge Gerry* (New England Historical and Genealogical Register, October);

(Period from 1789 to 1861): W. P. Garrison, *In Lundy's Land* [Benjamin Lundy] (Pennsylvania Magazine of History, October);

(Period since 1861): S. J. Perry, *Appeals to Lincoln's Clemency* (The Century, December); E. B. Andrews, *John Sherman's Story of his Own Career* (Review of Reviews, December); E. G. Ross, *Political Leaders of the Reconstruction Era* (Forum, October); E. B. Andrews, *The Last Quarter-Century in the United States* (Scribner's Magazine, — January); Hon. J. W. Foster, *Results of the Bering Sea Arbitration* (North American Review, December).

